



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

OCTOBER MEETING, 1905.

THE stated meeting was held on Thursday, the 12th instant, at three o'clock, P. M. ; the President in the chair.

The record of the June meeting was read and approved ; and reports were received from the Librarian and the Cabinet-Keeper. Among the gifts to the Library were two volumes of autographs from the heirs-at-law of our late associate Henry W. Taft, of Pittsfield. The Cabinet-Keeper called attention to some interesting engravings presented by the family of the late William S. Appleton, and gave a preliminary account of the autographs, early newspapers, and relics bequeathed to the Society by the late Charles E. French, of Boston.

The President reported from the Council two receipts and votes relating to the bequests of the late Robert C. Winthrop, Jr., with a recommendation that they be passed by the Society, and they were accordingly passed by a unanimous vote : —

Received of Francis C. Welch, Executor of the will of Robert Charles Winthrop, the younger of that name, late of Boston, in the County of Suffolk, deceased, testate, Five thousand dollars given by the first paragraph of his said will in words following: " First. I give to the Massachusetts Historical Society the sum of Five thousand dollars (\$5,000) to be added to and form part of the fund bequeathed to that Society by my Father, and called by his name," and the said Massachusetts Historical Society hereby accepts said legacy upon the terms set forth in said will and agrees to be bound thereby, and the said legacy being now paid within two years after said Executor has given bonds for the discharge of his trust the said Massachusetts Historical Society agrees to refund said legacy or so much thereof as may be necessary to satisfy any demands of legatees and creditors that may be hereafter recovered against the estate of said deceased and to indemnify said Executor against all loss and damage on account of this payment.

In witness whereof the said Massachusetts Historical Society has caused its corporate seal to be hereto affixed and these presents to be signed in its name and behalf by Charles C. Smith, its Treasurer,

thereto duly authorized this 12th day of October, A. D. Nineteen hundred and five.

Voted : That Charles C. Smith, the Treasurer, is hereby authorized and instructed to execute, acknowledge and deliver in the name and behalf of the Corporation the receipt and agreement which have just been read.

Received of Francis C. Welch, Executor of the will of Robert Charles Winthrop, the younger of that name, late of Boston, in the County of Suffolk, deceased, testate, Two thousand dollars given by the second paragraph of his said will in words following: "Second. I give to the said Massachusetts Historical Society the further sum of Two thousand dollars (\$2,000) to be added to and form part of the fund bequeathed to that Society by my kinsman, William Winthrop, of Malta, and called by his name; and I invite the attention of said Society to the fact that the income of this fund was directed to be applied to the binding of 'valuable manuscripts and books,' and that it has been a perversion of the intention of the donor to use it, or any part of it, for binding miscellaneous printed matter of little value," and the said Massachusetts Historical Society hereby accepts said legacy upon the terms set forth in said will and agrees to be bound thereby, and the said legacy being now paid within two years after said Executor has given bonds for the discharge of his trust the said Massachusetts Historical Society agrees to refund said legacy or so much thereof as may be necessary to satisfy any demands of legatees and creditors that may be hereafter recovered against the estate of said deceased and to indemnify said Executor against all loss and damage on account of this payment.

In witness whereof the said Massachusetts Historical Society has caused its corporate seal to be hereto affixed and these presents to be signed in its name and behalf by Charles C. Smith, its Treasurer, thereto duly authorized this 12th day of October, A. D. Nineteen hundred and five.

Voted . That Charles C. Smith, the Treasurer, is hereby authorized and instructed to execute, acknowledge and deliver in the name and behalf of the Corporation the receipt and agreement which have just been read.

The President presented from the New York Historical Society an impression of the medal struck for that Society in commemoration of the centennial anniversary of its organization. The medal has on the obverse a head of John Pintard, whose name is also closely associated with the formation of this Society.

Hon. Samuel A. Green handed in the memoir of the late Henry W. Taft which he had received during the summer vacation from the late Hon. JAMES M. BARKER.

The PRESIDENT then said :

For the twelfth time I welcome the members of the Society back from the vacation period.

During the four months since our last meeting, I am not aware that anything has occurred calling for record or particular mention. The work of the Society has pursued its regular course ; and while numerous celebrations of greater or less interest have occurred, none have been more than local, nor has there been any especial reason why the Society, as such, should participate in them. At the June meeting reference was made by me to our late associate Robert C. Winthrop, Jr., as he always continued to designate himself even after the death of his father. Mr. Winthrop, it will be remembered, died on the evening of Monday preceding our meeting ; he was buried from the chapel of the Theological School, on Brattle Street, Cambridge, the afternoon of Friday (9th). Subsequently it appeared that the Society had not been forgotten by Mr. Winthrop in a testamentary way. Feeling an hereditary as well as a personal interest in it, the following bequests appeared in his will :—

“I give to the Massachusetts Historical Society the sum of five thousand dollars to be added to and form part of the fund bequeathed to the Society by my father, and called by his name. I give to the said Massachusetts Historical Society the further sum of two thousand dollars to be added to and form part of the fund bequeathed to that Society by my kinsman, William Winthrop, of Malta, and called by his name ; and I invite the attention of said Society to the fact that the income of this fund was directed to be applied to the binding of ‘valuable manuscripts and books,’ and that it has been a perversion of the intentions of the donor to use it, or any part of it, for binding miscellaneous printed matter of little value.”

It will at once be noticed that this bequest on the part of Mr. Winthrop is strikingly illustrative of that most amiable feature of his character to which I alluded in my announcement of his death at the June meeting,—the extreme reverence he always felt for his father, and the solicitude he showed for his memory. The bequest thus made to the

Society, it will be observed, is of the same kind and amount as that previously made by his father, and in addition thereto. The entire fund thus created will be known by his father's name.

The intimation of Mr. Winthrop as respects the use made of the income of the William Winthrop fund will, of course, hereafter be carefully regarded.

Mrs. Winthrop also advises me as follows in regard to another reference to the Society in the will of her husband: —

“All the family papers and others were left to me with the suggestion that I should give to the Society forty-three folio and other volumes, of which I have a detailed list. He requests that they should be kept in the oak cabinet given by him and lettered ‘Winthrop Papers.’ There is other historical material which, if I choose, I may give to the Society, but I shall decide about that later. I have forty-three volumes I propose sending to the Historical Society when I return to town in November.”

It affords me much gratification, therefore, to report to the Society, and put on record in our printed Proceedings, the fact that, before the expiration of the year, all this most valuable collection of papers — the gift, through his widow, of the younger Robert C. Winthrop — will be deposited with this Society, becoming its property. Its ownership, apparently, passes to us. Certainly no safer or better depository could be found; but the value of the accession from an historical point of view cannot easily be estimated, while it would not admit of expression in money. Our collections are vastly enriched.

Until this meeting was close at hand, I had hoped to be able to announce to the Society that we met with numbers unimpaired. Such, I regret to say, is not the case. John Hay, a Corresponding Member, had, it is true, died at Newbury, New Hampshire, on the 1st of July; but of Mr. Hay it surely is unnecessary to speak now. Placed on our roll of Corresponding Members at the June meeting of 1900, his death is so recent, and the published notices of him have been so numerous, that further reference here is manifestly superfluous. It is otherwise as respects Judge Barker. Born in Pittsfield October 23, 1839, he was elected a Resident Member the 9th of April, 1896. At the time of his death, therefore, he had been a member

a few days less than nine years and a half. It is a suggestive fact that, though the ten years of his membership were not yet completed, Judge Barker's name stood fifty-second on our roll. To us older members his election seems recent. Meanwhile the time which has since intervened has sufficed, within a small fraction, to renew the membership of the Society by one-half.

As one of the justices of the Supreme Judicial Court of the Commonwealth, official duties necessarily prevented Judge Barker from taking an active part in our proceedings, or, in fact, being often present at our meetings. Other and obligatory engagements kept him elsewhere. He was, nevertheless, an interested as well as appreciative member. Representing the western part of the State, he was present here whenever his attendance in court would permit, and was always ready to assume, and promptly perform, any duty which might be assigned to him. Accordingly, it was Judge Barker who, at our meeting of October 12, 1899, paid tribute to his associate on the bench of the Supreme Judicial Court, Chief Justice Field. He also prepared a memoir of President Paul A. Chadbourne, which he presented at the meeting of November 10, 1904. Recently he had been appointed to write a memoir of Henry W. Taft, of Pittsfield, a fellow-townsmen. Judge Barker's death, which occurred in this city shortly after the autumn sessions of the Supreme Court began, was wholly unanticipated; and yet it was characteristic of the man that the obligation thus imposed and assumed was already discharged. Promptitude was one of his characteristics; and the last time he visited this building, only two months before his death, he brought with him the memoir he had agreed to furnish. More than that, he also then notified us of a valuable gift to the Society of papers, autographs, etc., from the family of Mr. Taft, for which, doubtless, we are also under obligation to him; for it is safe to assume that the disposition was made at his suggestion. I will only further add that Judge Barker never served on any committee of the Society, nor was he a member of its Council.

Judge Barker was appointed a justice of the Superior Court of the Commonwealth by our associate Hon. John D. Long, during his term as Chief Executive of the Commonwealth. I shall ask Mr. Long to favor the Society with the

characterization usual on the announcement of the death of an associate.

In response to the President's invitation, Hon. JOHN D. LONG spoke as follows:—

I am glad to respond so far as I can to your call, and I do so thinking of Judge Barker not only as a member of this Society and a public official of high rank, but as a personal friend of many years, the memory of whose kind face and kind greeting and sweetly companionable personality is very grateful to me, as I am sure it is to us all. I knew him, not man and boy, but old man and young man, although those terms seem unfitting, for there was always an almost singular evenness and continuity of quality and tenor in him from first to last, so that in youth he had the poise and prudence of age and in age the freshness and openness in mind and heart of youth.

He was always easily in prominence, not like a towering monument on a pedestal, but like a fair white stone on the highway of our New England life. Some men come into sight by the display of exceptionally brilliant qualities and achievements, some by persistent push and forceful manipulation of agencies, and some by simple strength of character not so much asserting itself as turned to by the public, which always carries a lantern and is on the lookout for an honest man. Public advancement comes to men of this last class more easily when they have the added quality of loveableness, sympathy with the community felt by it as well as felt by them,—a quality expressed in the vernacular "We like him," and by the use in addressing them of the first or given name and often the diminutive of that, as was the case with Mr. Barker, not from any lack of personal dignity, which in him was very marked, but from the personal affection and good-will felt for him by his early neighbors and friends. If he were to-day a citizen of New York City, where just now the only hope of one political party's success is in finding the best of men as well as one with the popular element in him, the Judge was the sort of man who would be asked to run for Mayor.

Among his classmates in college he was their beloved, and his word weighed. A young lawyer in his native town of Pittsfield, without prestige as a brilliant advocate or resort

however proper to canvassing activities, he was sent to the General Court because of the general pride in his worth and confidence in his good judgment, his discretion, his absolute integrity. There among his legislative associates their recognition of the same qualities put him in the front rank of the leaders not of debate but of direction and legislation. Later, in selecting a member from the western part of the State on the commission for revising the tax laws, it was Mr. Barker, with his reputation at home and in the Legislature, to whom Governor Talbot's attention was turned. So, too, with Governor's Talbot's successor when a similar member was to be associated with Charles Allen and Uriel Crocker on the commission for revising the public statutes of the Commonwealth, and when in 1882 a vacancy occurred on the Superior Bench, Mr. Barker's appointment to which was universally approved. So, too, when Governor Russell promoted him in 1891 to the Bench of the Supreme Judicial Court,—an appointment equally approved; and as it was the appointment of a man not of the then governor's political party antecedents, it set an example just now followed by our present highly deserving chief magistrate in the promotion of Judge Sheldon from the Superior to the Supreme Court.

It is in the latter place that Mr. Barker achieved his highest mark. He was admirably equipped for it by nature and training. He had distinctively the judicial quality. He was a diligent student of the law, both of its precedents and its general principles. He was fair-minded, industrious, patient, wise, courteous, neither garrulous nor austere. He had a fine sense of justice, of right and truth. His integrity, intellectual as well as moral, was structural,—a gift rather than a virtue. Somebody said in eulogy of Senator Hoar that he never yielded to the temptations which attend a public official to feather his own nest. It was not well put, because with a man of the Senator's organic qualities there are no such temptations; he never faces them because for him they do not exist. It might as well be said that he never yielded to the temptation to eat thistles or wear an iron helmet on his head. Of the same sort was Judge Barker. And of the same sort, thank Heaven, are so many of our trusted ones, who in every community, in city or in rural hamlet, set the standard of conduct. Indeed one characteristic of Judge Barker is that

he is a type of the men who serve in similar lines, — the faithful judges of our courts, the better class of legal advisers and counsel, the good citizens.

Judge Barker was not limited to the law. He was always interested in public affairs. Of independent mind, he yet participated in political party councils and canvasses. He went to State and national conventions. He was always on the side of better things, of the reform of the civil service, of the uplift of political methods and results. He was a model of good citizenship, a loyal alumnus and trustee of his college, a very charm in the domestic and social circle. He dearly loved rural New England, and with a gentle humor enjoyed the quaintnesses and shrewd wit of the New England folk. It was his delight to camp on the seashore among the fishermen, and especially was it his delight to wander over the Berkshire hills, which were so familiar to him, to fish its streams, and to put himself in sympathy with its atmosphere and with its rural people, every one of whom knew him and cherished him. A healthy, all-round, wholesome man, good and true, he exemplified the simple life and preached it by living it. He embodied the ideal of the birth, culture, spirit, life, and service of a son of Massachusetts. When death came he had nothing in the past to regret, nothing in the future to fear. His accounts were all squared on the ultimate ledger. And he rests in peace!

Mr. John Noble was appointed to write the memoir of Justice Barker for publication in the Proceedings.

The PRESIDENT submitted the following paper, which, he said, because of its length, would in full occupy much more than the prescriptive twenty minutes. He accordingly read portions of it only.

Nearly a year ago, our associate Mr. Rhodes caused to be sent to me an advance copy of the then forthcoming fifth volume of his History. In his case, and under the circumstances, the conventional note of acknowledgment, expressive of the great pleasure anticipated in a more or less remote future perusal, was clearly out of the question; but, as I was then circumstanced, the immediate and careful reading of a bulky octavo of six hundred pages was scarcely less so. I therefore frankly wrote Mr. Rhodes that it would be necessary for me to lay the volume aside against some time of greater leisure;

but, when the occasion presented itself, I proposed to improve it by making his gift the subject of a communication to this Society. Even if it might not be in my power to add anything new in the way of material, not impossibly I might contribute something not wholly devoid of value by approaching the subject from a point of view in some respects different from his.

Not until June did the opportunity present itself. It then came in the form of a business trip to the Pacific coast, the tedium of a portion of which was greatly relieved by Mr. Rhodes's narrative. The period covered in this volume, — the twenty-one momentous and ever memorable months between December, 1864, and August, 1866, — is within my own recollection. As an actor, I bore my part, even if a very subordinate one, in some of the military operations which then took place; and, when the war drums ceased to beat and the battle-flags were furled, I was deeply interested in the subsequent political movements and discussions in this volume described. I have thus lived to hearken to the verdict of the historian upon men with whom I associated, and events of which I was part; and I will freely confess it has been to me matter of no small satisfaction to find the mature judgment of the historian in greatest degree coinciding with my own long ago feelings, and the convictions I at the time entertained. In reading the book, I passed my own recollections in review.

Even if I saw occasion for it, the present would, to my mind, on mere grounds of good taste, be neither a proper time nor a suitable place for a controversial paper, much less for adverse criticism of Mr. Rhodes's work, which I do not hesitate to call great. But I am glad, on the threshold and once for all, to acknowledge that, as the result of my study of our associate's volume, I find in it little call to controversy, and none for adverse criticism. On the contrary, it has left upon me the impression of a thoroughly good piece of up-to-date historical writing; and, in my judgment, it tends distinctly to elevate rather than to lower that high traditional standard established for our Society in other days and by men of a former generation. As an organization, we have a right to pride in such work. Based on the careful study of a vast mass of material, patiently gathered and judiciously considered, the book is lit-

erary in tone and calm in spirit. The period dealt with is one of abiding interest and of far-reaching moment. Its significance will only increase with the lapse of time, and to its history this volume will, I make bold to say, prove a contribution of lasting value. If for no other reason, it will so prove from the fact that it is not so far removed from the time of which it treats as to cease to be contemporaneous. He who writes has in this case shared in the intensity of that of which he writes; with his own eyes he has seen many of the actors in the events of which he treats, and his ears have drunk in their own descriptive words. How great an advantage this may prove to one competent to avail himself of it has been shown more recently by Clarendon and Thiers, as in the classic times by Tacitus and Thucydides. What is more, I am willing here to put on record the belief that the judgments now rendered by Mr. Rhodes, as to both men and events, will prove in essentials to be in harmony with the ultimate verdict. Nor is this something lightly said; for I hold that the men and events of the period of Gettysburg and Emancipation will be studied and weighed not less closely by the Carlyles, the Macaulays and the Gardiners of the twenty-third century than were the events and men of the Naseby and Commonwealth period by those I have named of the nineteenth.

But if this is no place for the adverse criticism by one associate of the work of another, ours, on the other hand, is no mutual admiration society. Having therefore put myself right in a general way as to the estimate in which I hold the volume under consideration, I shall proceed to point out what I take to be certain defects and shortcomings therein. In writing history, especially the narrative of events still to a large extent contemporaneous, much necessarily depends on the point of view. The direction of approach involves, indeed, nothing less than the question of perspective, and the relative proportion of parts. On these, in turn, depend to some extent the conclusions reached. Upon this subject I have already more than once set forth my views, and I will not now repeat them or myself. On one occasion,¹ however, I found an illustration in the writings of two of our Corresponding Members, — Captain A. T. Mahan and Mr. Henry Adams. Both, it will be remembered, treated of the events of the same

¹ Proceedings, 2d series, vol. xiii. pp. 107, 108.

period,—the momentous Napoleonic period,—and of the connection of the United States with those events. Mr. Adams approached the problem from the diplomatic point of view; Captain Mahan from the Sea-Power side. Both views unquestionably are essential to a correct understanding of what then took place, its why and its when, its wherefore as well as its outcome. They supplement each other; yet, neither separately nor together, do they make plain the complete inwardness of that highly complex situation. So far as the United States was concerned, the key to the mystery is to be sought in the commercial necessities of the time and the combatants; and the problem needed to be approached from the trading point of view. But neither of the investigators was a trader, much less a banker or a merchant. Accordingly there is still a phase of the narrative waiting for some one to supply.

Coming now directly to the point, and Mr. Rhodes's fifth volume, he therein approaches his subject in a general way. Neither a politician nor a soldier, he is as unskilled in practical diplomacy as he is innocent of any study of international law; nor can he be classed as a publicist. Once, indeed, a man of affairs, he is now a judiciously minded general investigator, bringing much hard common-sense to bear, always modestly, on the complex problems of a troubled and eventful period. Now it so chanced that, in dealing with certain phases of that same period, I have approached the subject from a more specialized point of view. Though myself, at the time Mr. Rhodes deals with in this volume, in the army, or living here in Boston, I have since, not unnaturally under the circumstances, studied the problems involved from the diplomatic standpoint,—the position then occupied by my father, with whose papers I have chiefly had to deal. In what I now have to say, therefore, I propose to point out, in a spirit of criticism wholly friendly, what seem to me certain deficiencies and shortcomings of Mr. Rhodes's treatment, when thus looked at. They will prove not inconsiderable. Indeed, they go, in my judgment, to the heart of the story.

At the close of his summary of the war, in that chapter devoted to a consideration of the internal affairs of the Confederacy during the struggle, Mr. Rhodes suggests a query which I have often put to myself, and over which I have, first and last, pondered much. Tersely stated, it is this:—How was

it that we ever succeeded in overcoming the seceded States? Mr. Rhodes says: "A certain class of facts, if considered alone, can make us wonder how it was possible to subjugate the Confederates. It could not have been accomplished without great political capacity at the head of the Northern government, and a sturdy support of Lincoln by the Northern people."¹ This, I submit, is an inadequate answer to a perplexing question, — a question which goes to the heart of any correct historical treatment of our Great Rebellion, to adopt Clarendon's title. Surely it goes without saying that to overcome a combination of numbers, resources and territory such as that composing the Southern Confederacy implied great political capacity in the overcoming power, and the sturdy popular support of him upon whom the task devolved. As Shakespeare causes Horatio to observe in another connection, "There needs no ghost come from the grave to tell us this." But the question suggested by Mr. Rhodes cannot, I submit, being one of a very perplexing character, satisfactorily be disposed of by generalities. To formulate an answer at once definite and satisfactory, we must, descending to particulars, be more specific.

The usual and altogether conventional explanation given is the immense preponderance of strength and resources — men and material — enjoyed by one of the two contending parties. The census and the statistics of the War Department are then appealed to, and figures are arrayed setting forth the relative population and wealth, — the resources, manufactures and fighting strength of the two sides. As the result of such a showing, a certain amount of astonishment is finally expressed that the Confederacy ever challenged a conflict; and the conclusion reached is that, under all the circumstances, the only real cause for wonder is that such an unequal contest was so long sustained.

But this answer to the question will hardly bear examination. After the event it looks well, — has a plausible aspect; but in 1861 a census had just been taken, and every fact and figure now open to study was then patent. The South knew them, Europe knew them; and yet in the spring of 1861, and from Bull Run in July of that year to Gettysburg and Vicksburg in 1863, no unprejudiced observer anywhere believed

¹ Vol. v. p. 481.

that the subjugation of the Confederacy and the restoration of the old Union were reasonably probable, or, indeed, humanly speaking, a possibility. Mr. Gladstone, a man wise in his generation, and as a contemporaneous observer not unfriendly to the Union side, only expressed the commonly received and apparently justified opinion of all unprejudiced on-lookers, when at Newcastle, in October, 1862, he made his famous declaration in public speech that "Jefferson Davis and other leaders of the South . . . have made a nation. . . . We may anticipate with certainty the success of the Southern States so far as regards their separation from the North. I cannot but believe that that event is as certain as any event yet future and contingent can be." No community, it was argued, numbering eight millions, as homogeneous, organized and combative as the South, inhabiting a region of the character of the Confederacy, ever yet had been overcome in a civil war; and there was no sufficient reason for supposing that the present case would prove an exception to a hitherto universal rule. All this, moreover, was so. Wherefore, then, the exception? How was it that, in the result of our civil war, human experience went for nothing?

Was, then, the unexpected really due to preponderance in force? Confederate authorities have, of late, evinced a strong disposition to insist upon this as the correct and sufficient explanation. Their contention has been discussed here very recently by our associate Colonel Livermore.¹ In order to make out even a *prima facie* showing, the Confederate authorities have assumed, or endeavored to show, that the South never, from Sumter to Appomattox, had over 600,000 men in the aggregate in arms; and these, first and last, were opposed by, as they assert, some 2,800,000 on the part of the Union. Admitting these figures to be correct of both sides, — a large admission, and one which the analysis of Colonel Livermore has effectually disposed of, — it is none the less obvious that a force six hundred thousand strong, made up of fighting material of the most approved character, wholly homogeneous, acting on the defensive, mustered for the protection of the hearthstone, is something not easily overcome. It constitutes in itself a very large army; and one more especially formidable when the minds of those composing it are to the last degree

¹ Proceedings, 2d series, vol. xviii. pp. 432-444.

embittered against an opponent whose courage, as well as capacity, they held in almost unmeasured contempt. Such a force would, under the conditions existing in 1861 and 1862, unquestionably have considered itself, and been pronounced by others, quite adequate for every purpose of Southern defence.

But this estimate of Confederate field force obviously invites criticism of another character. It calls for explanation. The Confederate historians and investigators responsible for it do not seem to realize that, in the very act of advancing it, they cast opprobrium on the community they belong to and profess to honor. If this estimate is sustained, the verdict of the historian of the future cannot be escaped. He will say that if 600,000 men were all the Confederacy, first and last, could get into the field, it is clear that the South went into the struggle in a half-hearted way, and, being in it, showed but a craven soul. No effort of the government, no inducement of pride or patriotism, sufficed to get even a moiety of its arms-bearing men into the fighting line.

Such a showing on the part of the Confederacy, if established, will certainly not compare favorably with the forty years' later record of the Boers in the very similar South African struggle. Accepting the Confederate figures as correct, how do the two cases stand? Territorially the Confederacy covered some 712,000 square miles,—a region considerably (30,000 square miles) larger than the combined European areas of Austro-Hungary, Germany, France and Italy, with Belgium, Holland and Denmark thrown in. This vast space was inhabited by five million people of European descent, with three millions of Africans who could be depended upon to produce food for those of European blood in active service. In the course of the conflict, and before admitting themselves beaten, every white male in the Confederacy between the ages of seventeen and fifty capable of bearing arms was called out. Wherever necessary to preclude evasion of military duty the writ of habeas corpus was suspended, and the labor, property and lives of all in the Confederacy were by legislation of the most drastic character put at the disposal of an energetic executive. The struggle lasted four full years; and during that period the eighth part of a generation grew up, yielding its quota of arms-bearing men. Consequently, under any recognized method of computation, the Confederacy, first and last,

contained within itself some 1,350,000 men capable of doing military duty. This result, also, is in accordance with the figures of the census of 1860.¹ During the war the Confederate army was reinforced by over 125,000 sympathizers² from the sister slave States not included in the Confederacy. The upshot of the contention thus is, out of a population of 5,600,000 whites, only 475,000 put in an appearance in response to a many-tongued and often reiterated call to arms, — a trifle in excess of one man to each twelve inhabitants. There were, moreover, more than 500,000 able-bodied negroes well adapted in every respect for all the numerous semi-military services, — such as teamsters, servants, hospital attendants and laborers on fortifications, the call for which always depletes the number present for duty of every army.³ Yet it is now maintained by Confederate authorities that all the efforts of the Richmond government, backed by every feeling of pride, patriotism, protection of the domestic roof-tree and hate of the enemy, could only induce or compel a comparatively Spartan band to turn out and strike for independence.

¹ The exact number, arithmetically computed on the census returns of 1860, but of course to a certain extent inaccurate and deceptive, was 1,356,500.

² An exact statistical statement of the number of sympathizers from Maryland, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Missouri, who, first and last, found their way into the ranks of the Confederate army, is, of course, impossible. It has been asserted that there were 316,424 "Southern men in the Northern army." This large contingent, so far as not imaginary, would naturally have come in greatest part from the "Border States," so called. It would be not unnatural to assume that these States furnished an equal number of recruits to the Confederacy; but such an assumption would, on the basis above given, be manifestly absurd. The War Records contain lists of all military organizations of the Confederate army referred to in that publication. Including regiments, battalions and companies belonging to all branches of the service, regular and provisional, these numbered 279 from the four States, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri and Tennessee. Included in these were 238 full regiments. If these averaged, from first to last, only 600 each, they included an aggregate of 143,000 men. No less than 132 lesser organizations, battalions, and companies, and all individual enlistments, remain to be allowed for. Colonel Livermore, in view of these facts, writes me under date of October 24, 1905, "I think a larger estimate than 135,000 in the Confederate army from these States might safely be made."

³ "I propose to substitute slaves for all soldiers employed out of the ranks — on detached service, extra duty, as cooks, engineers, laborers, pioneers, or any kind of work. Such details for this little army amount to more than 10,000 men. Negroes would serve for such purposes, better than soldiers. . . . The plan is simple and quick. It puts soldiers and negroes each in his appropriate place; the one to fight, the other to work. I need not go into particulars." (Gen. J. E. Johnston to Confederate Senator L. T. Wigfall, January 4, 1864. Mrs. D. G. Wright, *A Southern Girl* in '61, pp. 168, 169.)

How was it, under very similar circumstances, with the South Africans? On Confederate showing they are a braver, a more patriotic and self-sacrificing race. Two communities, the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, were engaged in a defensive struggle against Great Britain. They included within their bounds an area of 160,000 square miles,—less than a fourth of that included in the Confederacy. Their entire white population was but about 325,000, and, when the war commenced, it was estimated they could muster a force not in excess of 48,000. In countries equally defensible, the Confederates had seven whites to a square mile of territory, the Boers had two. Yet in their two years of resistance the Boers, it is computed, had 90,000 men, first and last, in actual service, or more than one in four of their population, as against the one out of twelve in the case of the Confederacy.¹ The preponderance of force opposed to the Boers was as five to one; the preponderance of force in the case of the Confederates, according to this latest estimate of their historians, was at most but four and a half to one.²

¹ To be exact, one out of each eleven and eight-tenths.

² We have census (1860) figures of the population of the States of the Confederacy at the breaking out of the Civil War; but the Confederate muster-rolls, showing actual enlistments, are confessedly defective. It is not easy to reach any accurate figures as to either the population of the two South African republics, or the number of men actually put into the field by them during the war. The "total number of officers and men of all Regular and Auxiliary [British] Forces in the South African War from the beginning to the end" is officially stated as 448,435. At the beginning of the war the Intelligence Division of the British War Office estimated the total available forces of the Transvaal at 29,917, and those of the Orange Free State at 13,104, or an aggregate of 43,021 combatants. At the close of the war, however, the total number accounted for was 72,974 Transvaal and Free State combatants, with 16,400 "Rebels," "Renegades and Foreigners," or a grand total of 89,374. The British officials content themselves with saying "it is difficult to explain the excess over the Boer official returns [preceding the conflict] unless, indeed, these purposely understated the actual strength of the burghers." (Report (1903) of "His Majesty's Commissioners appointed to Inquire into the Military Preparations and Other Matters Connected with the War in South Africa," pp. 35, 158, 168.) Excluding in each case foreign sympathizers, the two South African republics apparently put into the field as combatants one man to each four and two-tenths (4.2) of their entire population; on the claim of the Southern historians the nine States of the Confederacy put into the field one combatant to each eleven and eight-tenths (11.8) of their total white population. The relative aggregate fighting force of the Boers was to that of the British almost exactly one to five. The force of the Confederacy (600,000), as claimed by Southern authorities, to that of the Union, as stated by the same authorities (2,778,304), was about as one to four and a half.

Such an estimate is, however, as far from the mark as, were it based on actual facts, it would be discreditable to Confederate manhood. It is simply unbelievable that, measured by the proportion of fighting men to the total populations, the Boer spirit was to the spirit of the Confederacy as three is to one. The statement carries its own refutation; and the Southerners of that period were no such race of mchings, mean-spirited, stay-at-home skulkers as their self-constituted and most ill-advised annalists would apparently make them out. On the contrary, as matter of historical fact, they did both turn out in force and they fought to a finish. Undoubtedly there was, towards the close of the contest, a large desertion from the Confederate ranks. The army melted imperceptibly away. The men would not stay by the colors. When, in April, 1865, Jefferson Davis, after his flight from Richmond, met, at Greensboro', North Carolina, Joseph E. Johnston, then in command of the army confronting Sherman, a species of council was held at which the course to be pursued, in the then obviously desperate condition of affairs, was discussed. Johnston, knowing well the condition of things, and the consequent feeling among his men, when appealed to for his opinion bluntly said that the South felt it was whipped, and was tired of the war. Davis, on the other hand, was eager to continue the struggle. He insisted that in spite of the "terrible" disasters recently sustained, he would in three or four weeks have a large army in the field; and, further, expressed his confident belief that the Confederates could still win, and achieve their independence, if, as he expressed it, "our people will turn out."¹

That Davis even then honestly so thought is very probable; and, looking only to the number of fighting men on each side available for service under proper conditions, he was right. And yet under existing conditions he was altogether wrong. As respects mere numbers, it is capable of demonstration that, at the close of the struggle, the preponderance was on the side of the Confederacy, and distinctly so. The Union at that time had, it is said, a million men on its muster rolls. Possibly

¹ Alfried, *Life of Jefferson Davis*, pp. 622-626; B. T. Johnson, *Life of Joseph E. Johnston*, p. 219; Roman, *Military Operations of General Beauregard*, vol. ii. p. 665. Roman here prints a letter, dated March 30, 1868, from J. E. Johnston to Beauregard, giving his recollections of what was said and took place at the Greensboro' meeting of April 12-13, 1861.

that number were consuming rations and drawing pay. If such was the case, acting on the offensive and deep in a vast hostile country, the Union might possibly have been able to put 500,000 men in the fighting line. On the other side, notwithstanding the heavy drain of four years of war, the fighting strength of the Confederacy at the close cannot have been less than two-thirds of its normal strength. The South should have been able to muster, on paper, 900,000 men. Such a force, or even the half of it, acting on the defensive in a region inadequately supplied with railroad facilities, — and these, such as they were, very open to attack, — should have been ample for every purpose. Texas alone had in 1860 a white population larger by nearly 100,000 than the white population of the Transvaal and Orange Free State combined in 1899.¹ Texas covered an area of 265,780 square miles, as against the 161,296 of the combined African republics; and this vast region was rendered accessible in 1861 by some 300 miles of railroad, or about one mile of railroad of most inferior construction to each 900 square miles of territory.² The character of the soil made heavy movement, slow and difficult always, at times impossible. In such a region and under such conditions, how could an invading force have been fed or transported, or kept open its lines of communication? Thus, on the face of the facts, Davis was right, and the South, if it chose to defend itself, was invincible.

And here we find ourselves face to face with one of the greatest of the many delusions in the popular conception of practical warfare. In his remark at the Greensboro' conference about the South "turning out," Jefferson Davis seems to have fallen into it. The South, at that stage of the conflict, simply could not "turn out." So doing was a physical impossibility. It was Napoleon who said that an army was like a serpent, it moves on its belly. In dealing with practical conditions in warfare, it has always to be borne in mind that an army

¹ According to the best authorities, the combined white population of the two South African states at the beginning of hostilities was approximately 323,113; the white population of Texas was returned in the census of 1860 at 421,294.

² The census of 1860 returned 307 miles of railroad in operation in Texas; in 1903 it was stated that 11,256 miles were in operation. The proportion of railroad mileage to area was, in 1860, one mile to each 865 square miles of territory; in 1903 it was one mile to each 24 square miles.

is a most complex organization; and its strength is measured and limited not by the census number of men available, but the means at hand of arming, equipping, clothing, feeding and transporting those men. Mere numbers in excess of those means constitute not strength, but an encumbrance. The supernumeraries are in the way; they not only tumble over each other, but they aggravate the shortages. It was so with the Confederate army in the last stages of the Civil War. The men were there; nor did the leaders want more just so long as they were unable to arm, clothe, feed and transport those they already had. Both Lee's army and Johnston's army melted away as the alternative to starvation. Under such circumstances, if all the men in the South had flocked to the colors it would only have made matters worse; the rations and ammunition would have given out so much the sooner. The artillery and commissariat trains could not be hauled when the horses were dead of inanition. In other words, after January, 1865, the possibility of organized resistance on the part of the Confederacy no longer existed. The choice lay between surrender and disbandment; or, as General Johnston subsequently wrote: — "We, without the means of purchasing supplies of any kind, or procuring or repairing arms, could continue this war only as robbers or guerillas."¹

The next question is, — How had this result been brought about? How did it happen that five millions of people in a country of practically unlimited extent, and one almost invulnerable to attack, were physically incapable of further organized resistance? How did they come to be so devoid of arms, food, clothing and means of transport? In other words, what is the correct answer to the query suggested by Mr. Rhodes? He certainly does not give it; but, perplexing as the question is, a plausible answer can surely at this late day at least be approximated.

Lord Bacon long ago, in some passage I well remember but have not been able now to find, compares the judgment passed on current events by foreign nations with that of posterity. We may there, as he points out, find the necessary detachment and sense of proportion; also that absence of prejudice and passion which, to some extent, makes good

¹ Johnston to Beauregard, March 30, 1863: Roman, Beauregard, vol. ii. p. 665.

deficiencies of knowledge. Turning over the pages of an English periodical lately, I came, in its issue for July, 1866, across a somewhat elaborate paper entitled "The Principles and Issues of the American Struggle."¹ Philosophizing over the outcome of the struggle rather more than a year after it had been brought to a close, the writer of the article thus answered Mr. Rhodes's query some thirty-eight years in advance of the time when Mr. Rhodes put it:—

"By dint of obstinate endurance — by dint of illimitable paper money and credit — by dint of foreign soldiers from Ireland and Germany who swarmed into the country, allured by bounties on enlistment varying from £100 to £200 sterling per head — by dint of sacrificing general after general, however brave and able, who could not gain a victory — by dint of a blockade of the sea-board, producing in due time a famine, or something very like it, through the most fertile portions of the South; and last, but by no means least, by dint of the cowardice or incapacity of the British government, that refused to unite with that of France in acknowledging the independence of the South — the Northern people conquered their Southern brethren."

Here, then, is a foreign contemporaneous explanation, and one, in some respects, close to the mark. Yet it is not wholly satisfactory. It again is too general; for, though the writer is specific enough, he generalizes in his specification, omitting nothing that suggests itself, and emphasizing everything about equally. Further elimination and a more severe analysis are necessary.

Six contributing causes are specified. Let us, through the perspective of forty years, see which still stand as material. The initial two, "obstinate endurance" and "illimitable paper dollars and credit," we may pass over. The first goes without saying; and the last would not in itself have sufficed to accomplish the end sought in 1865 any more than it had sufficed to accomplish the end then sought, when an advantage in the hands of Great Britain in the struggle that ended in 1783. The third count also cuts no considerable figure in a revised summary. The backbone of the Union army at the close of the struggle, as at its beginning, was made up of Americans. The number of foreigners, Irish or German, drawn to the country by the temptation of bounties may have

¹ Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine, July, 1866, vol. c. p. 31.

been considerable; but, as an advantage on the side of the Union, it was far more than counterbalanced by the drastic conscription enforced throughout the Confederacy. Three factors now only remain for consideration. One of these, the sacrificing of those leaders who failed to win victories, is a feature of all warfare, and in no way peculiar to our civil strife. As a factor in results it was not peculiarly in evidence there. The allusion is apparently to McClellan; but, in his case, history, and the coming to light of historical material, have more than justified the course finally pursued by Lincoln and Stanton. Of the two remaining factors of success, — the blockade and absence of foreign intervention, — the last may be left out of consideration. It is useless to discuss historical problems from the point of view of what would have happened if something had occurred which in point of fact never did occur. On this foreign and contemporaneous judgment of conditions we are thus through elimination brought down to one factor, the blockade, as the controlling condition of Union success. In other words, that success was made possible by the undisputed naval and maritime supremacy of the North. Cut off from the outer world and all exterior sources of supply, reduced to a state of inanition by the blockade, the Confederacy was pounded to death.

Or, to put the proposition in yet another form, in the game of warfare, maritime supremacy on the part of the North — what Captain Mahan has since developed historically as the Influence of the Sea Power — even more than compensated for the military advantage of the defensive, and its interior strategic lines, enjoyed by the South. Such being the case, the greater command by one party to the conflict of men, supplies, munitions and transportation worked its natural result.

Unquestionably much could be said in support of this contention. More than plausible, it fairly explains an outcome otherwise inexplicable now, as contrary to all foreign expectation then. Without, however, going into any elaborate discussion of the arguments for and against it as a satisfactory historical postulate, but for present purposes accepting it as such, a distinct grasp and full recognition of the advantage in the struggle pertaining to the mastery of the sea is to my mind the most marked deficiency in Mr. Rhodes's treatment

of the outcome of the conflict. In this respect his narrative is lacking in a proper sense of proportion. As compared with the space devoted to the movements on land, he fails to give to the sea operations the emphasis properly belonging to them. Towards the close of that portion of his fifth volume devoted to a summary of the preceding narrative, Mr. Rhodes, it is true, does incidentally say that the "work of the United States navy was an affair of long patience unrelieved by the prospect of brilliant exploits; lacking the incitement of battle, it required discipline and character only the more. But the reward was great; for the blockade was one of the effective agencies in deciding the issue of the war."¹ This is a somewhat faint recognition of services really decisive; but, such as it is, it may pass. As one reads Mr. Rhodes's narrative, however, it would hardly be supposed that a blockade existed at all, much less that it entered into the struggle as the essential pivot on which turned many of the most important of those land movements so fully described. For instance, an undisputed maritime supremacy made possible Sherman's march to the sea.

To this general criticism, an exception must be made in the case of the action between the Monitor and the Merrimac. To that a sufficiency of space (five pages) is given; for, obviously, on its result depended McClellan's strategy. Besides being temptingly dramatic in itself, it had to be dealt with in connection with land operations. But the capture of Hatteras Inlet (August 26, 1861) and of Port Royal (November 7, 1861) are incidentally mentioned in part of a twenty-three line paragraph, though strategically they were, and subsequently proved, of the utmost consequence, distinctly foreshadowing that process of devitalization as a result of which the Confederacy ultimately collapsed. Again, the taking of New Orleans, from every point of view one of the most important events of the war as well as one of its most striking episodes,—a knife-thrust in the very vitals of the Confederacy,—is disposed of in two pages; the sinking of the Alabama by the Kearsarge is truly enough referred to "as of no moment towards terminating the war"; but its moral effect in Europe at a critical period was very memorable. Finally, to assert that the achievements of Admiral Farragut con-

¹ Vol. v. p. 399.

tributed not less than those of General Sherman to the downfall of the Confederacy may or may not be an exaggeration; but, on the part of the navy, it may safely be claimed that the running of the forts at the mouth of the Mississippi, and the consequent fall of New Orleans, was as brilliant an operation, and one as triumphantly conducted, as the march through Georgia. It struck equal dismay into the hearts of the Southern leaders. Yet the name of Farragut appears but once in the index of Mr. Rhodes's fifth volume, in which he summarizes the war; and that once is in connection with Andrew Johnson's famous "swinging-round-the-circle" performance. Twelve lines of text are devoted to the battle of Mobile Bay, while two lines only are made to suffice for the capture of Wilmington, which closed the last inlet of the Confederacy, hermetically sealing it. Here, then, from Hatteras Inlet to Fort Fisher, — between August, 1861, and January, 1865, — is a consecutive series of operations, prime factors in the final result, and they are disposed of in ninety lines of a narrative covering 1,350 pages. About a sixth of one per cent of the entire space is given to them. With Hilton Head, Hatteras Inlet, New Orleans, Hampton Roads, Mobile Bay, Wilmington and Cherbourg blazing imperishably on the record, Mr. Rhodes incidentally remarks that the work of the navy was "unrelieved by the prospect of brilliant exploits"! Nor do the names of those identified with our naval triumphs thunder in the general index. Judged by that test, six lines suffice for the allusions to Farragut, and five for those to Porter; while four solid columns are judged scarcely adequate for Grant, and two for Sherman. This, I submit, is disproportionate. In some future edition an entire chapter for each year would not be too much to devote to an account of the operations of that arm of the Union service which on the sea counterbalanced that advantage of interior lines on the land the Confederates so confidently counted upon, and of which all the military strategists or critics, whether domestic or foreign, so everlastingly wrote. Throttling the Confederacy throughout, the navy was also a spear-thrust in its back.

Passing to another topic of scarcely less importance, the sense of correct proportion is again at fault. The Confederacy did not go into the conflict unadvisedly. On the contrary, its leaders gave what at the time they considered full considera-

tion to all the factors on either side essential to success.¹ As was apparent in the outcome, they reckoned without their host; but, none the less, they did reckon. Unfortunately for it, the Southern community in the years prior to 1861 was phenomenally provincial. Judged by its literature and the published utterances of its men and women, particularly its women, it seemed — intellectually, socially, economically and physically — to be conscious only of itself. This characteristic, among many other phases of development, was inordinately and most offensively apparent in an undervaluation of its prospective opponent both for character and courage, and in an overvaluation of the importance of the South as a commercial world-power. As respects the undervaluation of the prospective opponent, the mental condition of the South in 1861 has since been very tersely stated by General Bradley T. Johnson, himself a Confederate, though born in Maryland,—at once jurist and veteran: — “The Southern people for several generations had trained themselves into a vainglorious mood toward the Northern men. They believed that they were unconquerable by the North, and that the men of the North were not their physical nor mental equals.”² And, reviewing the conflict and outcome through the vista of thirty years, this typical Southron reached a conclusion, bearing directly on the query suggested by Mr. Rhodes: — “The Confederate States were not crushed by overwhelming resources nor overpowering numbers. They were *out-thought* by the Northern men.”³ As respects the other great factor of self-deception, the overvaluation of itself by the South as a commercial world-power, the mere mention of that delusion recalls to memory the once familiar, now quite forgotten, postulate,—“Cotton is

¹ For instance, in the very matter of a blockade, as an incident to war, James H. Hammond, then in the Senate from South Carolina, in a speech delivered in 1858, and presently referred to, thus summarily dismissed the idea as an absurdity: “We have three thousand miles of continental sea-shore line so indented with bays and crowded with islands that when their shore lines are added, we have twelve thousand miles. . . . Can you hem in such a territory as that? You talk of putting up a wall of fire around eight hundred and fifty thousand square miles so situated! How absurd.” (Selections from Letters and Speeches of James H. Hammond, pp. 311, 312.)

² “Vulgar, fanatical, cheating Yankees — hypocritical, if as women they pretend to real virtue; and lying, if as men they pretend to be honest.” (W. H. Russell, *My Diary North and South*, chap. xix.)

³ *Memoir of the Life and Public Service of Joseph E. Johnston* (1891), pp. 60, 61.

King!" To the South its infatuation on this point was the fruitful mother of calamity; for the commercial supremacy of cotton, accepted as a fundamental truth, was made the basis of political action. The unquestioning faith in which that patriarchal community cherished this belief has now passed out of memory, and the statement of it savors of exaggeration. As a matter of fact it does not admit of exaggeration. For instance, what modern historical presentation could be so framed as to exceed in strength, broadness and color the following from a speech delivered in the United States Senate, March 4, 1858? James H. Hammond, representing South Carolina, then said:—

"But if there were no other reason why we should never have war, would any sane nation make war on cotton? Without firing a gun, without drawing a sword, should they make war on us we could bring the whole world to our feet. The South is perfectly competent to go on one, two, or three years without planting a seed of cotton. . . . What would happen if no cotton was furnished for three years? I will not stop to depict what every one can imagine, but this is certain: England would topple headlong and carry the whole civilized world with her, save the South. No, you dare not make war on cotton. No power on earth dares to make war upon it. Cotton *is* King. Until lately the Bank of England was king, but she tried to put her screws as usual, the fall before the last, upon the cotton crop, and was utterly vanquished. The last power has been conquered. Who can doubt, that has looked at recent events, that cotton is supreme?"¹

It would not be difficult to multiply almost indefinitely utterances like the above; but for the purpose in hand this one will suffice. Intensely provincial, the idea was vulgar; in the jargon of the Stock Exchange the South thought she had a corner on Cotton, and, if she so willed it, the World must walk up to her counter, and settle on any terms she saw fit to prescribe! As Russell, of the London Times, observed,— "These tall, thin, fine-faced Carolinians are great materialists. Slavery perhaps has aggravated the tendency to look at all the world through parapets of cotton-bales and rice-bags, and though more stately and less vulgar, the worshippers here are not less prostrate before the 'almighty dollar' than the Northerners."²

¹ Selections from the Letters and Speeches of James H. Hammond (New York, 1866), pp. 316, 317.

² My Diary North and South, chap. xv.

Thus, in complete provincialism and childlike faith a community was willing to venture, and actually did venture, life, fortune and sacred honor on its contempt for those composing the largest part of the community of which they were themselves but a minority, and on the soundness of a commercial theory. In regard to the extent and implicit character of the faith held on both these points no better witness could testify than Dr. William H. Russell, the once famous Times Crimean correspondent just referred to. Russell certainly had no prejudice against the South, or Southern men. On the contrary, he liked both; while he did not take kindly to the North as a whole, or to its people. He was, however, a foreign observer with a remarkable faculty for vivid description, and here to take notes and to portray things as they appeared. He was in South Carolina immediately after the bombardment of Sumter, and there mixed freely with the exponents of public sentiment. In his Diary he thus describes what he heard on the subject of Southern superiority and cotton supremacy, — he is recording what occurred at the Charleston Club on the evening of April 16, 1861, ex-governors of the State, senators, congressmen, and other prominent South Carolinians being of the company: —

“We talked long, and at last angrily, as might be between friends, of political affairs.

“I own it was a little irritating to me to hear men indulge in extravagant broad menace and rodomontade, such as came from their lips. ‘They would welcome the world in arms with hospitable hands to bloody graves.’ ‘They never could be conquered.’ ‘Creation could not do it,’ and so on. I was obliged to handle the question quietly at first — to ask them ‘if they admitted the French were a brave and warlike people!’ ‘Yes, certainly.’ ‘Do you think you could better defend yourselves against invasion than the people of France?’ ‘Well, no; but we’d make it pretty hard business for the Yankees.’ ‘Suppose the Yankees, as you call them, come with such preponderance of men and *matériel*, that they are three to your one, will you not be forced to submit?’ ‘Never.’ ‘Then either you are braver, better disciplined, more warlike than the people and soldiers of France, or you alone, of all the nations in the world, possess the means of resisting physical laws which prevail in war, as in other affairs of life.’ ‘No. The Yankees are cowardly rascals. We have proved it by kicking and cuffing them till we are tired of it; besides, we know John Bull very well. He will make a great fuss about non-interference at first, but

when he begins to want cotton he'll come off his perch.' I found this was the fixed idea everywhere. The doctrine of 'cotton is king' — to us who have not much considered the question a grievous delusion or an unmeaning babble — to them is a lively all-powerful faith without distracting heresies or schisms." ¹

The following day, Dr. Russell was one of a party on an excursion down Charleston harbor, visiting Forts Sumter and Moultrie. In the course of the trip he met, among others, L. T. Wigfall, the notorious Texan who had recently resigned a seat in the Senate of the United States to throw in his fortunes with the Confederacy. Dr. Russell says in his Diary, April 17: —

"For me there was only one circumstance which marred the pleasure of that agreeable reunion. Colonel and Senator Wigfall, who had not sobered himself by drinking deeply, in the plenitude of his exultation alluded to the assault on Senator Sumner as a type of the manner in which the Southerners would deal with the Northerners generally, and cited it as a good exemplification of the fashion in which they would bear their 'whipping.'" ²

A day or two later, Mr. Bunch, the British consul at Charleston, who not long afterwards achieved a most unhappy diplomatic notoriety, entertained Dr. Russell at dinner. It was a "small and very agreeable party," but of the talk at that table the guest recorded: —

"It was scarcely very agreeable to my host or myself to find that no considerations were believed to be of consequence in reference to Eng-

¹ My Diary North and South, chap. xiii. Later, April 19, the Times correspondent called on the Governor of the State, F. W. Pickens. Of him he wrote: — "The Governor writes very good proclamations, nevertheless, and his confidence in South Carolina is unbounded. If we stand alone, sir, we must win. They can't whip us." (*Ibid.* chap. xvi.)

² A month later Mr. Wigfall received, through his wife, from a correspondent in Providence, Rhode Island, an ardent sympathizer with the Confederacy, a warning curiously characteristic of the period, and most suggestive of the estimate in which the Northern community was then held by those impregnated with Southern ideals: —

"I think, however, that you at the South are wrong to undervalue the courage and resources of the Northern States. They are no doubt less accustomed to the use of firearms — there are very few who know how to ride, and they are less fiery in their impulses. They are less disposed to fight, but they are not cowardly where their interests are concerned and will *fight for their money*. Where their property is at stake they will not hesitate to risk their lives. . . . I would not advise you of the South to trust too much in the idea that the Northerners will not fight; for I believe they will, and their numbers are overwhelming." (Mrs. D. G. Wright, *A Southern Girl in '61*, pp. 52, 53.)

land except her material interests, and that these worthy gentlemen regarded her as a sort of appanage of their cotton kingdom. 'Why, sir, we have only to shut off your supply of cotton for a few weeks, and we can create a revolution in Great Britain. There are four millions of your people depending on us for their bread, not to speak of the many millions of dollars. No, sir, we know that England must recognize us,' &c.

"Liverpool and Manchester have obscured all Great Britain to the Southern eye. I confess the tone of my friends irritated me."

He next visited the leading merchants, bankers, and brokers:—

"In one office I saw an announcement of a company for a direct communication by steamers between a southern port and Europe. 'When do you expect that line to be opened?' I asked. 'The United States cruisers will surely interfere with it.' 'Why, I expect, sir,' replied the merchant, 'that if those miserable Yankees try to blockade us, and keep you from our cotton, you'll just send their ships to the bottom and acknowledge us. That will be before autumn, I think.' It was in vain I assured him he would be disappointed. 'Look out there,' he said, pointing to the wharf, on which were piled some cotton bales; 'there's the key will open all our ports, and put us into John Bull's strong box as well.'"

A guest shortly after on the island plantation of Mr. Trescot, he there met Edmund Rhett, a member of a family prominent in South Carolina public life. The Rhett dwelling house and plantation were on Port Royal Island, a few miles only from the smaller island on which Mr. Trescot dwelt. They thus were neighbors. The stranger and guest describes the South Carolinian as "a very intelligent and agreeable gentleman," but from his lips also came the same old story. "'Look,' he said, 'at the fellows who are sent out by Lincoln to insult foreign courts by their presence.' I said that I understood Mr. Adams and Mr. Dayton were very respectable gentlemen, but I did not receive any sympathy; in fact, a neutral who attempts to moderate the violence of either side, is very like an ice between two hot plates. Mr. Rhett is also persuaded that the Lord Chancellor sits on a cotton bale. 'You must recognize us, sir, before the end of October.'"¹

¹ This meeting was on April 28. A few days only more than six months later both the Rhetts and Mr. Trescot hurriedly abandoned their homes, im-

As respects the outcome of what may well enough be called the South's cotton campaign, Mr. Rhodes's narrative seems to me deficient. That campaign was in fact the most far-reaching and, in world effect, the most important inaugurated and carried out by the Confederacy; and in its result they sustained complete and disastrous defeat,—a defeat which entailed on them in the midst of the contest and in presence of the enemy, an entire change of front, economical, financial and diplomatic. This nowhere appears in Mr. Rhodes's narrative; and yet on this phase of the struggle both Confederate finance and Confederate diplomacy hinged. And here again the blockade comes to the front.

Had the theory as respects the potency of cotton on which the South went into the war been sound, the blockade would have proved the Confederacy's most potent ally; for the blockade shut off from Europe its supply of cotton as it could have been shut off by no other possible agency. In so far the government of the Union played the game of the Confederacy, and played it effectively. In the early days of the struggle, they talked at Richmond of an export duty on their one great staple, and of inhibiting its outgo altogether; the blockade made any action of this nature quite unnecessary. Through the blockade the cotton-screw, so to speak, was applied to the fullest possible extent. Nor was the overthrow of the potentate brought about easily. He was well entrenched, and dethroning him entailed on the commercial world one of the most severe trials it has ever been called upon to pass through. In this phase of the struggle Lancashire was the field of central battle; and there, as the result of a struggle extending through eighteen months, the Confederate ikon was tumbled down. The catastrophe was complete; and the whole Southern programme, economical, fiscal, and, at last, strategic, where it did not utterly collapse, underwent great change. The summer of 1862 marked the crisis; before that, as Mr. Rhodes truly states,¹ the Confederate policy was to keep cotton at home, and by withholding it to compel foreign recognition; after that, the one effort was to get it to market with a view to its diately after the bombardment and capture of the forts at Hilton Head, November 7, 1861, by the expedition under command of Captain, afterwards Admiral, Dupont. All of the South Carolina sea-islands, as they were called, were thenceforth occupied by the Union forces.

¹ Vol. v. p. 382.

conversion into ships, munitions of war and necessities of life. But Mr. Rhodes, in my judgment, disposes of this crucial Confederate defeat altogether too lightly. Mr. Rhodes says: "As we have seen, [England and France] when they could not get cotton from America, got it elsewhere." I do not know on what authority this statement is made; but it is not in accordance with the facts. In the early months of 1861 the estimated weekly consumption of cotton in Great Britain was 50,000 bales; at the close of 1862 it had fallen to 20,000 bales, inferior in weight as well as quality. Indeed so bad was the quality that its manufacture was destructive to machinery. Of this greatly reduced quantity, moreover, a considerable portion—some twenty per cent—was the American product, run through the blockade. So great was the dearth that in September, 1862, the staple, which two years before had sold in Liverpool for fourpence a pound, had gone up until it touched the unheard-of price of half a crown. Cotton simply was not forthcoming from any quarter, and the commercial world was everywhere in search of substitutes for it.

To this subject, from my point of view, Mr. Rhodes might well have devoted a chapter. As it stands, it is a case of anticlimax; introduced with a loud blast of trumpets, the potentate simply vanishes,—so to speak, he evaporates. How, and what became of him, nowhere appears. Judging by Mr. Rhodes's narrative, one would infer that it was a case of insensible dissolution; but, as an historical fact, it was very far otherwise. Not all that Mr. Hammond and others predicted, or that the Confederate leaders confidently looked to see happen, actually did happen; but, none the less, the process involved a commercial and industrial disturbance of the first magnitude, and the most complete and disastrous defeat sustained by the Confederacy in the whole course of the war. The episode, too, carried with it a most instructive historical lesson as to the danger even nations incur from indulging with undue confidence in a theory,—in other words, the old South furnished in 1860-61 a very striking illustration of the homely truth that the evils incident to what is humanly known as a condition of mental "cocksureness" are not confined to individuals. In 1860 that whole Southern community was socially and economically daft. But no people and no

period are exempt from such states of delusion. Within the memory of those now living this country has been subject to a dozen such; in the eyes of not a few it is to-day suffering under more than one. Fortunately, so far as deep water and destruction are concerned, the experience of the South was exceptional. It was a dream; but a dream from which the awakening must have been terribly bitter. The first indication I have found of a recurrence to common-sense was in a speech made by William L. Yancey at an impromptu reception given him in the rotunda of the St. Charles Hotel at New Orleans, on his return in March, 1862, from that wholly abortive mission to Europe on which he had been sent by Jefferson Davis a year before. He had learned something in the course of his travels, and he then significantly said: "It is an error to say that 'Cotton is King.' It is not. It is a great and influential power in commerce, but not its dictator." A little foreign travel had educated that particular Southern prophet out of some of his provincialism. Almost immediately his words found an echo in Richmond, a Louisiana Senator there sadly declaring in debate, "We have tested the powers of King Cotton and have found him to be wanting."¹ While three months later, in June, 1862, Alexander H. Stephens enunciated too late the correct principle. They had been possessed with the idea, he told them, that "cotton was a political power. There was the mistake,—it is only a commercial power."²

Passing to the other topics in the treatment of which the narrative of Mr. Rhodes, though sufficiently full, seems from my point of view open to criticism, I next refer to his account of Sherman's famous march to the sea in November, 1864, and

¹ Appleton's *Annual Cyclopædia*, 1862, p. 261, quoted by Rhodes, vol. v. p. 411.

² What is known as the alternative Confederate fiscal policy is referred to, and discussed, by Mr. Rhodes (vol. v. pp. 381, 382). There is in the appendix to *Roman's Life of Beauregard* (vol. ii. pp. 674-680) an elaborate letter on this subject written by Mr. Stephens to Beauregard in 1862, seventeen years after the close of the struggle. In the letter he quoted at length from a speech made by him at Crawfordville, Georgia, in the fall of 1862. He then said: "The great error of those who supposed that King Cotton would compel the English ministry to recognize our government and break the blockade, and who will look for the same result from the total abandonment of its culture, consists in mistaking the nature of the kingdom of the potentate. His power is commercial and financial, not political."

Grant's advance on Richmond in May, 1864. Mr. Rhodes quotes General Sherman as saying in his Memoirs: "Were I to express my measure of the relative importance of the March to the Sea and of that from Savannah northward, I would place the former at one and the latter at ten, or the maximum." We are then told, in a foot-note to the same page,¹ that General Schofield was of a different opinion. "Considered," he said in his *Forty-six Years* (p. 348), "as to its military results, Sherman's march cannot be regarded as more than I have stated — a grand raid. The defeat and practical destruction of Hood's army in Tennessee was what paved the way to the speedy termination of the war, which the capture of Lee by Grant fully accomplished; and the result ought to have been essentially the same as to time if Sherman's march had never been made."

On this point Mr. Rhodes expresses no opinion. He wisely leaves it for the military critics to fight it out among themselves. I can, however, say that at the time, and in Europe, this view of the relative importance of operations did not obtain. Far from it. Schofield, of course, refers to Sherman's march north from Savannah, through the Carolinas; but I gravely doubt whether his estimate of the strategic importance of that march, or Sherman's estimate of its relative importance as compared with that through Georgia, are either of them correct. While, so far as the fall of the Confederacy was concerned, both exercised great influence on the outcome, from my point of view I incline to the belief that the march through Georgia was the more potent in influence of the two. It was so for an obvious reason. In war, as in most other affairs in which mankind gets itself involved, moral effects count for a good deal; and especially is this so with somewhat volatile and excitable communities, such as that inhabiting the South unquestionably was. But, so far as Europe was concerned, it is safe to assert that no other operation of the entire war was productive of a moral effect in any way comparable with that caused by the march to the sea. Indeed, coming as it did and when it did, it is not too much to say it was an epochal event in that it marked the turning of the tide of European and especially of English opinion as respects the United States and things American.

¹ Vol. v. p. 107.

James Russell Lowell wrote a well-remembered essay "Upon a Certain Condescension in Foreigners"; and, during the earlier stages of the Civil War, this well-understood "condescension" resolved itself quite naturally into a studied tone of scorn, in no way veiled. The change which has since become so marked in this respect began with Sherman's march. That march in a way smote the foreign imagination; and the whole course of subsequent events, down to the treaty negotiated last summer at Portsmouth, has served to promote what has now developed into a revolution in tone and estimate. As every one realizes, Lowell's "foreigner" has undergone a total change; his "condescension" is of the past. The beginning of that change I had occasion to trace through the utterances of the European press. Up to the autumn of 1864, and the re-election of Lincoln, the general tone of the European and especially of the English periodicals and papers was one of exaggerated admiration for Confederate valor and leadership; while, on the other hand, the leadership and courage of the Union side were referred to with studied contumely. Sometimes, however, the contempt was equally distributed over both parties to the fray. The famous remark attributed at least to Von Moltke is still remembered, that he "did not have time to devote to the study of the combats of two armed mobs." But a much more curious and illustrative utterance was one of Charles Lever, the Irish military novelist, who, most unfortunately for himself, chose as the time and place in which to deliver himself the January Blackwood's of 1865. The paper was, of course, prepared some time before. By mere ill luck, however, it appeared in London just as Sherman put in his appearance at Savannah. In this paper Mr. Lever undertook to compare the American combatants to two inmates of a lunatic asylum playing chess. They went through moves similar to those of chess, but without the slightest comprehension of the game. He then goes on, — "Now, does not this immensely resemble what we are witnessing this moment in America? There are the two madmen engaged in a struggle, not one single rule nor maxim of which they comprehend. Moving cavalry like infantry, artillery like a wagon train, violating every principle of the game, till at length one cries Checkmate, and the other, accepting the defeat that is claimed against him, deploras his mishap, and

sets to work for another contest. . . . Just however, as I feel assured, nobody who ever played chess would have dignified with that name the strange performance of the madmen, so am I convinced that none would call this struggle a war. It is a fight — a very big fight, if you will, and a very hard fight too, but not war.”¹ There is much more to the same effect, the intensely ludicrous side of which at just that juncture the genial Irishman himself subsequently appreciated most keenly. What I have quoted will, however, suffice for the purpose of present illustration. At the very time Mr. Lever was thus rashly committing himself in cold print, General Sherman was entering on his famous march; and, while that march was in progress, the daily tone of the London newspapers was pitched in much the same key as that of Mr. Lever’s lucubration in the forthcoming number of *Blackwood*. The outcome of the move of the “Yankee” General was looked for with a contemptuous interest; it clearly was not war; a hare-brained effort, dictated probably by desperation, it could end only in disaster; most probably it was an ill-considered attempt at getting out of an impossible military situation. But one day the tidings came that the heads of Sherman’s columns had emerged on the sea-coast, that they had made short work of the forces there found to oppose them, and that Savannah had fallen. The army and the navy had struck hands! The announcement seemed absolutely to take away the breath of the foreign critics, military and journalistic. A brilliant strategic blow had been struck; an operation, the character of which could neither be ignored nor mistaken, had been triumphantly carried through to a momentous issue; the thrust—and such a thrust!—had penetrated the vitals of the Confederacy;—what next? From that moment the end was plainly foreshadowed. Europe recognized that a new power of unknown strength, but undeniable military capacity, was thenceforth to be reckoned with.

To one feature, and one feature only, in Mr. Rhodes’s account of this memorable war episode, do I care to call attention. The historian, I fear, passes somewhat gently over the pronounced vandalism which characterized Sherman’s operations

¹ Cornelius O’Dowd upon Men and Women and other Things in General: Part XII., “The Fight over the Way.” *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine*, vol. xcvi. pp. 57–59.

from Atlanta to Savannah, and yet more from Savannah to Raleigh. It is referred to, indeed, both generally, and, more especially, in connection with what occurred in South Carolina, reaching a climax at Columbia; but the treatment is, notwithstanding, distinctly perfunctory.¹ The other, and I very much fear, the truer and more realistic, side is portrayed in sufficient detail, and with reference to chapter and verse, in General Bradley T. Johnson's *Life of Joseph E. Johnston*.² It there appears what Sherman meant by his famous aphorism — "War is Hell." The truth is that in 1864-65 the conflict had lasted too long for the patience of the combatants, and the defence of the South had been very stubborn. The rules and limitations of civilized warfare, so far as non-combatants were concerned, were no longer observed, and Sherman's advancing army was enveloped and followed by a cloud of irresponsible stragglers, known throughout the country as "bummers," who were simply for the time being desperadoes bent on pillage and destruction, — subject to no discipline, amenable to no law. They were looked upon then by the North, weary of the war, with a half-humorous leniency; but, in reality, a band of Goths, their existence was a disgrace to the cause they professed to serve. For a Northerner it is not a pleasant admission, but the historic, if ungrateful, truth is that, as respects what are euphemistically termed the "severities" of warfare, the record made by our armies during the latter stages of the conflict will not bear comparison with that of the Army of Northern Virginia while in Pennsylvania during the Gettysburg campaign. Lee's memorable general order (No. 73) dated at Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, June 27, 1863, is well known, and need not be quoted; but there was truth in the reference to those opposed to him when in it he said, "No greater disgrace could befall the army, and through

¹ "It seems probable that the inhabitants of North Carolina were better treated than had been those of the sister State. Nevertheless correction of the bad habits engendered in the soldiery by the system of foraging upon the country was only gradually accomplished and the irregular work of stragglers was not circumscribed by State boundary lines. . . . The men who followed Sherman were probably more humane generally than those in almost any European army that marched and fought before our Civil War, but any invading host in the country of the enemy is a terrible scourge. On the other hand there is considerable Southern evidence of depredations committed by Wheeler's cavalry." (Vol. v. pp. 102, 104.)

² Chapters xi., xii., xiii. pp. 119-225.

it our whole people, than the perpetration of barbarous outrages upon the unarmed and defenceless, and the wanton destruction of private property, that have marked the course of the enemy in our own country. It will be remembered that we make war only upon armed men." It was my fortune to be a participant in the Gettysburg campaign,¹ and, forty years later, I was glad when occasion offered to bear my evidence to the scope and spirit in which Lee's order was at the time observed by his followers. "I doubt if a hostile force ever advanced into an enemy's country, or fell back from it in retreat, leaving behind it less cause of hate and bitterness than did the Army of Northern Virginia in that memorable campaign."² Our own methods during the final stages of the conflict were sufficiently described by General Sheridan, when, during the Franco-Prussian War, as the guest of Bismarck, he declared against humanity in warfare, contending that the correct policy was to treat a hostile population with the utmost rigor, leaving them, as he expressed it, "nothing but their eyes to weep with over the war."³

¹ Proceedings, 2d series, vol xiii. p. 106.

² Speech at thirteenth annual dinner of the Confederate Veterans Camp of New York, at the Waldorf-Astoria, January 26, 1903; the annual Confederate commemoration of General Lee.

³ "Thursday, September 8, 1870. — The Chancellor gives a great dinner, the guests including the Hereditary Grand Duke of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, Herr Stephan, the Chief Director of the Post Office, and the three Americans. Amongst other matters mentioned at table were the various reports as to the affair at Bazeilles. The Minister said that peasants could not be permitted to take part in the defence of a position. Not being in uniform, they could not be recognized as combatants — they were able to throw away their arms unnoticed. The chances must be equal for both sides. Abeken considered that Bazeilles was hardly treated, and thought the war ought to be conducted in a more humane manner. Sheridan, to whom MacLean has translated these remarks, is of a different opinion. He considers that in war it is expedient, even from the political point of view, to treat the population with the utmost rigour also. He expressed himself roughly as follows: 'The proper strategy consists in the first place in inflicting as telling blows as possible upon the enemy's army, and then in causing the inhabitants so much suffering that they must long for peace, and force their Government to demand it. The people must be left nothing but their eyes to weep with over the war.' Somewhat heartless, it seems to me, but perhaps worthy of consideration." (Bismarck: Some Secret Pages of his History, Busch, vol. ii. p. 127.) To the same effect General Sherman subsequently declared: "I resolved to stop the game of guarding their cities, and to destroy their cities. We were determined to produce results, and now what were those results? To make every man, woman and child in the South feel that if they dared to rebel against the flag of their country they must die or submit."

The subsequent influence on the American army of General Sherman's famous

In other words, a veteran of our civil strife, General Sheridan, advocated in an enemy's country the sixteenth-century practices of Tilly, described by Schiller, and the later devastation of the Palatinate policy of Louis XIV., commemorated by Goethe. In the twenty-first century, perhaps, partisan

"War is Hell" aphorism, and its illustration in his campaigns in Georgia and the Carolinas, is deserving of notice.

Lieutenant-General S. B. M. Young spoke to the same effect as General Sheridan, at Prince Bismarck's table, at a public dinner given by the New York Chamber of Commerce at the Arlington Hotel, Washington, in honor of the representatives of certain foreign commercial bodies then in America, November 13, 1902. General Young then pronounced "all the army's defamers densely ignorant of what constitutes the laws of war," and added, "To carry on war, disguise it as we may, is to be cruel, it is to kill and burn, burn and kill, and again kill and burn." If the word "humane" could be applied to war, he would define it as one "fast and furious and bloody from the beginning." He added, "When war has been decided on by our nation I agree with the German Emperor's sentiments, and believe that the American army should leave such an impression that future generations would know we had been there." (N. Y. Tribune, November 14, 1902.)

The utterance of the German Emperor here referred to was his famous speech at Bremenhaven, July 27, 1900, to the first contingent of his army then embarking for China. He said: "When you meet the foe you will defeat them. No quarter will be given; no prisoners will be taken. Let all who fall into your mercy be at your mercy. Just as the Huns a thousand years ago, under the leadership of Attila, gained a reputation in virtue of which they still live in historical tradition, so may the name of Germany become known in such a manner in China that no Chinaman will ever again dare to look askance at a German."

At a court-martial convened in Manila twenty-one months after this utterance, Brigadier-General Jacob H. Smith declared that in operations conducted by him as General in command he had instructed a subordinate "not to burden himself with prisoners"; that he told him "that he wanted him to kill and burn in the interior and hostile country; and did also instruct him that 'The interior of Samar must be made a howling wilderness'; and did further instruct him that he wanted all persons killed who were capable of bearing arms and were actively engaged in hostilities against the United States; and that he did designate the age limit of ten years."

The court in this case found General Smith guilty of "conduct to the prejudice of good order and military discipline," and sentenced him to be admonished by the reviewing authority. The court declared itself thus lenient "in view of the undisputed evidence that the accused did not mean everything that his unexplained language implied; that his subordinates did not gather such a meaning; and that the orders were never executed in such sense." (57th Congress, 2d Session, Senate Document No. 213.)

Historically, however, it is noticeable that the instructions given by General Smith were in strict accordance with the "War is Hell" principles on which operations in a hostile country should be conducted as laid down on the occasion specified, by Lieutenant-General Sheridan, September 8, 1870, by the German Emperor, July 27, 1900, and by Lieutenant-General Young, November 13, 1902.

feeling as regards the Civil War performances having by that time ceased to exist, American investigators, no longer regardful of a victor's self-complacency, may treat the episodes of our struggle with the same even-handed and outspoken impartiality with which Englishmen now treat the revenges of the Restoration, or Frenchmen the dragonnades of the Grand Monarque. But when that time comes, the page relating to what occurred in 1864 in the valley of the Shenandoah, in Georgia, and in the Carolinas,—a page which Mr. Rhodes somewhat lightly passes over,—will probably be rewritten in characters of far more decided import.¹

¹ In his work entitled "Ohio in the War" (1868), Mr. Whitelaw Reid says of the burning of Columbia, "it was the most monstrous barbarity of the barbarous march. There is no reason to think that General Sherman knew anything of the purpose to burn the city, which had been freely talked about among the soldiers through the afternoon. But there is reason to think that he knew well enough who did it, that he never rebuked it, and made no effort to punish it. . . . He did not seek to ferret out and punish the offending parties. He did not make his army understand that he regarded this barbarity as a crime. He did not seek to repress their lawless course. On the contrary, they came to understand that the leader, whom they idolized, regarded their actions as a good joke, chuckled over them in secret, and winked at them in public. . . . In both campaigns [that from Atlanta to Savannah, and from Savannah to Goldsboro'] great bodies of men were moved over States and groups of States with the accuracy and precision of mechanism. In neither was any effort to preserve discipline apparent, save only so far as was needful for keeping up the march.

"Here, indeed, is the single stain on the brilliant record. Before his movement began, General Sherman begged permission to turn his army loose in South Carolina and devastate it. He used this permission to the full. He protested that he did not wage war on women and children. But, under the operation of his orders, the last morsel of food was taken from hundreds of destitute families, that his soldiers might feast in needless and riotous abundance. Before his eyes rose, day after day, the mournful clouds of smoke on every side, that told of old people and their grandchildren driven, in midwinter, from the only roofs there were to shelter them, by the flames which the wantonness of his soldiers had kindled. With his full knowledge and tacit approval, too great a portion of his advance resolved itself into bands of jewelry-thieves and plate-closet burglars. Yet, if a single soldier was punished for a single outrage or theft during that entire movement, we have found no mention of it in all the voluminous records of the march. He did indeed say that he 'would not *protect*' them in stealing 'women's apparel or jewelry.' But even this, with no whisper of punishment attached, he said, not in general orders, nor in approval of the findings of some righteously severe court-martial, but incidentally—in a letter to one of his officers, which never saw the light till two years after the close of the war. He rebuked no one for such outrages; the soldiers understood that they pleased him. Was not South Carolina to be properly punished?

"This was not war. It was not even the revenge of a wrathful soldiery, for it was practised, not upon the enemy, but upon the defenceless 'feeble folk' he had left at home. There was indeed one excuse for it—an excuse which chivalric soldiers might be slow to plead. It injured the enemy—not by open fight, where

One final topic; dealt with by Mr. Rhodes in his fourth volume rather than in the fifth, it still occupies a prominent place in his narrative, and its treatment necessarily involves a man who, first and last, for good or evil, will assuredly stand forth in history as one of Massachusetts' most conspicuous contributions to our Great Rebellion period. The topic is that Virginia campaign which made sadly memorable the spring and summer of 1864; the individual, General B. F. Butler. To my mind Mr. Rhodes has neither done justice, nor fully meted out justice, to the episode or to the man.

And, primarily, in the matter of Grant's strategy in that famous campaign. It seems to me to have been much better considered, and more creditable to him, than would be inferred from Mr. Rhodes's narrative. Mr. Rhodes then, secondarily, as I see it, fails to place where it belongs the grave responsibility for the failure of Grant's plan of campaign, with the awful loss of life that failure involved. My understanding has always been that Grant's plan assumed the active and harmonious co-operation of three distinct armies, — that of the Potomac, under General Meade; that of the James, under General Butler; and, finally, the Ninth Corps, 15,000 strong, under the command of General Burnside. Meade, with the Army of the Potomac, was to advance and engage Lee, holding the Confederate army of Northern Virginia fully occupied; Burnside, meanwhile, was to be in reserve, immediately in Meade's rear; and, while Lee was thus engaged, Butler, with the Army of the James, composed of two corps, the Tenth and Eighteenth, and in all some 35,000 to 40,000 strong, was to push forward vigorously, threatening Richmond, and jeopardizing Lee's communications. Thus an important, if not vital, part in the plan of operations depended on Butler and the Army of the James. Opposed to him, with his completely equipped and numerically formidable command, was a wholly inadequate and widely scattered force under General Beauregard, recently (April 15) assigned to that department, and not yet on the ground.¹ If by an offensive movement, intelli-

a million would have been thought full match for less than a hundred thousand, but by frightening his men about the situation of their wives and children!" (Ohio in the War, vol. i. pp. 475-479.)

¹ Beauregard was at Weldon, North Carolina, from April 22 to May 10, awaiting the development of the Union plan of campaign. He did not reach Petersburg until May 10.

gently conceived and skilfully as well as vigorously handled, the Confederate line could be broken and thrown back into Richmond, Lee's rear would be exposed, his lines of communication threatened, and he must, abandoning Richmond, have fallen back towards Lynchburg or the Carolinas. Grant then proposed to follow him up, hanging doggedly on his rear, and catch Lee between an upper and a nether mill-stone,—the Army of the James holding him in check until the Army of the Potomac, hurrying up, could force a decisive battle.

As a strategic plan this was open to criticism. Two distinct armies were to operate conjointly in wholly separate fields, with an active enemy between them, enjoying, of course, the advantage of shorter interior lines. By a rapid concentration of forces it was obvious that Lee might crush Butler, and then swiftly turn to confront Meade either from within the defences of Richmond or in the open. Not impossibly the Army of the Potomac might then be doomed to undergo, on the same ground, a repetition of its experiences of two years before. General Beauregard, it has since appeared, did indeed almost at once take in the situation from this point of view, and devised a plan of campaign accordingly.¹ Nevertheless, though involving some risk in the presence of two such commanders as Lee and Beauregard, both at once alert and vigorous, Grant's scheme of campaign was well considered and practical. He enjoyed a large numerical preponderance, and each of the three independent armies, if skilfully as well as energetically handled, was amply sufficient to take care of itself.

Had, accordingly, Grant's plan been carried out in all its parts,—south of the James as well as north of Richmond,—the terrible fighting of May and June in the Wilderness, and on the road to the James and Petersburg, would have been avoided. Richmond assuredly must have fallen; while the fate of Lee and his army would have been at least problematical. Though it is not probable that Appomattox could have been anticipated by a year, the Confederacy would have lost its capital, and Lee, with one of his two lines of communication with the Carolinas cut off, would have been confronted by the three Union armies, undepleted and combined under Grant.

¹ Roman, Beauregard, vol. ii. pp. 201, 202.

If such was Grant's plan, as I at the time and since have always understood, Mr. Rhodes gives no hint of it. He treats the campaign as if it had developed on the lines originally intended. If so, and I am right in my understanding, this does Grant great strategic injustice. His campaign failed, — failed in the beginning, and failed through the gross military incompetency of the General commanding the Army of the James.

An army could not well enter on an active campaign more auspiciously than did the Army of the Potomac in April, 1864. With full ranks, well disciplined, admirably equipped, inured to service, with confidence in itself and its commanders, it felt equal to any emergency of warfare. It was in fact a most formidable fighting machine; but, formidable as it was, the test to which it was subjected exceeded endurance. Plunging into the Wilderness, it found itself confronted by Lee at the head of the even more veteran Army of Northern Virginia, fighting on the defensive in a country peculiarly susceptible of an effective defence.¹ Mr. Rhodes has described

¹ In his Memoir of General William Farrar Smith, in the "Heroes of the Civil War Series," General James H. Wilson, both a very competent critic and one who on this subject spoke from intimate personal knowledge, attributed the ensuing failure of the campaign in greatest part to the very defective organization of the headquarters staff. For this, of course, Grant was wholly responsible. General Wilson says: "Without pausing here to recapitulate the arguments for and against the line and general plan of operations actually selected by General Grant, or to consider further his choice of subordinate commanders, it may be well to call attention to the fact that the organization and arrangements made by him for the control and co-operation of the forces in Virginia are now generally regarded by military critics as having been nearly as faulty as they could have been. . . . It was in the nature of things impossible to make either the armies or the separate army-corps work harmoniously and effectively together. The orders issued from the different headquarters were necessarily lacking in uniformity of style and expression, and failed to secure that prompt and unflinching obedience that in operations extending over so wide and difficult a field was absolutely essential, and this was entirely independent of the merits of the different generals or the peculiarities of their Chiefs of Staff and Adjutants General. The forces were too great; they were scattered too widely over the field of operations; the conditions of the roads, the width of the streams and the broken and wooded features of the battlefields were too various, and the means of transport and supply were too inadequate to permit of simultaneous and synchronous movements, even if they had been intelligently provided for, and the generals had uniformly done their best to carry them out.

. "But when it is considered that Grant's own staff, although presided over by a very able man from civil life, and containing a number of zealous and experienced officers from both the regular army and the volunteers, was not organized for the arrangement of the multifarious details and combinations of the marches and battles of a great campaign, and indeed under Grant's special

what ensued. In forty days the force in Lee's front reported 55,000 casualties. Meanwhile, what had become of the Army of the James? Why did it not play its part, working a diversion? Well do I remember, at the time and on the spot, when the news came that Beauregard, with a mere handful of men, — hardly more than a heavy skirmish line, — had foiled Butler. No relief was to be looked for from that quarter. It was at this juncture that Grant characteristically remarked that "Butler was as safe as wax; bottled up at Bermuda Hundred!" But the plan of campaign then went to pieces; while Lee, relieved from all anxiety because of Richmond and his rear, with his communications assured, was left free to oppose his entire force to the enemy before him. What ensued, Mr. Rhodes has sufficiently told in a previous volume.

In the volume now under consideration, however, Mr. Rhodes deals with Benjamin F. Butler judicially, — as one standing at the bar of history. The sentence he passes upon him is severe, and the more severe because carefully restrained in expression. But it is confined to questions of mere lucre, — "beyond reasonable doubt," Mr. Rhodes says, "he [Butler] was making money [illicitly] out of his country's life struggle." That is bad; but, however bad it may be, it is in my judgment the rendering on a very minor count in the long indictment to which Massachusetts' senior Major-General of the Civil War should be made to answer. His departmental dishonesty may be measured in dollars and cents; his headquarters incompetence cost blood and grief both unmeasured and immeasurable. Who was responsible for the greater part of that awful loss of life, — a loss numerically nearly equal to the entire army Napoleon had on the field at Waterloo? Primarily, it was that commander of the Army of the James who so utterly failed in doing the work he had himself insisted should be assigned him to do;¹ and, secondarily, to the

instructions made no efforts to arrange them, it will be apparent that properly co-ordinated movements could not be counted upon. . . . In addition to the defective organization and inefficient staff arrangements which have been mentioned, neither the Union government nor the Union generals ever made provisions, or seemed to understand the necessity, for a sufficient preponderance of force, to neutralize the advantages which the Confederate armies enjoyed, when fighting on the defensive, or to render victory over them reasonably certain."

¹ Yet in his farewell order to the Army of the James of January 8, 1865, Butler boasted — "The wasted blood of my men does not stain my garments." War Records, Serial No. 96, p. 71.

commander-in-chief who left a charlatan and an incompetent in the place to which he should have designated his trustiest lieutenant.¹ It was a parallel case to that of Grouchy, — the fatal mistake of the man at the head in the choice of a tool. Years ago, during the life of our late associate John C. Ropes, I frequently discussed with him — once (1894), I remember, on the field of Waterloo — what turn other than that history has recorded might have been given to the momentous 15th of June, 1815, had Davout, instead of being at the time Minister of War and in Paris, been, as he should have been, in command of Napoleon's right wing. It hardly admits of question that the victor of Auerstadt and Eckmühl, instinctively taking in the strategic situation, would have kept in close touch with the Emperor, and that Blücher would have found the road from Wavre to Waterloo effectually blocked. Napoleon's right arm would not then have been paralyzed; he would have been free to throw his whole army on Wellington's flank and rear. Fortunately for Wellington, Grouchy, and not Davout, was that day in command of Napoleon's detached wing. Butler's command and mission in the Virginia campaign of 1864 were almost exactly similar to the command and mission of Grouchy in the Waterloo campaign of 1815; and now to discuss the operations of the Army of the Potomac in the Wilderness and at Spottsylvania without constant reference to what the Army of the James was on those days doing south of the James, is a treatment no less defective than it would be to try to explain what took place at Waterloo without giving any consideration to Grouchy's blundering march from Gembloux to Wavre. Butler, like Grouchy, was left by the commander-in-chief to act, under general instructions, as the conditions of time and place, and the movements of the enemy in his front, might make more expedient, the plan of campaign and general strategic situation being always clearly in mind. Both failed, and failed

¹ "Lastly, to put such an important operation as this under the charge of a civilian who had never made any military reputation was really an unwarrantable piece of folly. If, as Badeau says, Mr. Lincoln insisted upon it on political grounds, it would have done Mr. Lincoln no harm for General Grant to have reminded him, in distinct and not to be misunderstood speech, that the Congress of the United States had placed him, Grant, in charge of the armies of the United States for the very purpose of seeing to it that this sort of thing should not occur in the future, as it had so often in the past." (J. C. Ropes, *Papers of Military Historical Society of Massachusetts*, vol. iv. p. 369.)

utterly. In each case incalculable disaster ensued. My point is that, in the narrative of Mr. Rhodes, Butler does not figure as the Grouchy of the Wilderness.

It is obvious enough now, and, when too late, was plain enough to Grant then, that a blunder of selection entailing infinite detriment was made. In planning his campaign of 1864 Grant should have taken no chances; and it is safe to say that at no subsequent period would he have entrusted to Butler any military operations. Probably at the time he relied on General W. F. ("Baldy") Smith, assigned to the command of the Eighteenth Corps, and second in rank in the Army of the James, to supply Butler with that military guidance of which he stood in such crying need. If this was so, Grant was wrong again. Smith was then fresh from Chattanooga, where he had shown great skill immediately under Grant's eye; and perhaps no one available in the whole Union army at that time promised a more brilliant future. So high an opinion did Grant then hold of Smith that when the newly appointed Lieutenant-General came East in February, 1864, to take full charge, he brought Smith with him, with the half-formulated idea of substituting him for Meade in command of the Army of the Potomac. This idea Grant subsequently abandoned, finding a place for Smith in the Army of the James; but, unfortunately, he did not substitute him for Butler as he had proposed to do for Meade. Instead of so doing he endeavored, taking a half-way course, by indirect means to work directions out. As usual, when in military operations that feat is attempted, a terrible mistake was made. Smith was, in fact, a skilful engineer; in all respects a good soldier; and, in some, a brilliant commander. But Butler, though himself a military harlequin, was a man not easy to guide; nor was "Baldy" Smith the man to guide him. On the contrary, he was almost the last of those high in rank to whom that task, at once difficult and delicate, should have been assigned.¹ A year later, General Grant would unquestionably have selected Sheridan to do the work thus hesitatingly assigned; but, in May, 1864, Sheridan had not forged to the front as he afterwards so rapidly did. None the less, just as it is curious to consider what would have been the

¹ "General Smith, whilst a very able officer, is obstinate, and is likely to condemn whatever is not suggested by himself." (Grant to Hancock, May 21, 1865.)

result in June, 1815, had Davout filled the position in Napoleon's command held by Grouchy, so we are free to philosophize to any extent we see fit over what might have happened in May and June, 1865, had Beauregard then found himself confronted by Sheridan instead of by Butler.

The recollection of events and talk of more than forty years ago was the sole basis for the statements made in the text, and the conclusions drawn therefrom. Throughout the period in question I was attached in a subordinate capacity to the headquarters of the Army of the Potomac, and was, almost of necessity, more or less familiar with operations then going on in the field, and the views generally held at and about headquarters of them, and of those who had had them in charge. But, however vivid and distinct it may be, the memory of what was asserted, or actually occurred, more than the lifetime of a generation ago is no basis for any historical statement. While revising this paper I have therefore sought to refresh my memory and verify my recollections by consulting portions of the vast mass of material put in print since 1865, especially the War Records, Grant's Personal Memoirs (1885), Butler's Book (1892), Roman's Military Operations of General Beauregard (1884), W. F. Smith's Chattanooga to Petersburg (1893), and, on the whole as illuminating as any, our late associate John C. Ropes's paper (1884) entitled Grant's Campaign in Virginia.¹ While from these authorities I have learned much I did not before know as to details, I have come across nothing affecting the general correctness of the impressions I at the time received.

Grant's original plan of combined campaign for the spring of 1864 was exactly that described. To quote his own language in his instructions to Meade, "Lee's army will be your objective point. Wherever Lee goes, there you will go also. Gillmore will join Butler with about 10,000 men from South Carolina. Butler can reduce his [Fortress Monroe garrison] so as to take 23,000 men into the field directly to his front. The force will be commanded by Major-General W. F. Smith. With Smith and Gillmore, Butler will seize City Point, and operate against Richmond from the south side of the river.

¹ This paper appears as Number XV. (pp. 363-405) in the volume entitled "The Wilderness Campaign," of the publications of the Military Historical Society of Massachusetts.

His movement will be simultaneous with yours.”¹ At the same time Grant wrote to Butler as follows:—Major-General Smith “is ordered to report to you to command the troops sent into the field from your own department. . . . The fact that Richmond is to be your objective point, and that there is to be co-operation between your force and the Army of the Potomac, must be your guide.” Butler was at once to seize City Point, and there, Grant wrote, “concentrate all your troops for the field as rapidly as you can. From City Point directions cannot be given at this time for your further movements.” Holding a firm base on the south bank of the James, Butler was thus left free to move in any direction he saw fit; and “should the enemy be forced into his intrenchments in Richmond, the Army of the Potomac would follow, and by means of transports the two armies would become a unit.”² Such were Butler’s instructions; meanwhile of Smith, who was “to command the troops sent into the field,” Grant at the same time wrote to Halleck, General Smith “is possessed of one of the clearest military heads in the army; is very practical and industrious. No man in the service is better qualified than he for our largest commands.”³ General Smith “is really one of the most efficient officers in service, readiest in expedients, and most skilful in the management of troops in action.”⁴ On the night of May 5th Butler debarked at Bermuda Hundred. The movement was a complete surprise to the Confederates. By mere chance General Hagood’s South Carolina brigade was moving by rail to Richmond, when, on the 6th of May at Walthall Junction, between Petersburg and Richmond, they encountered a brigade thrown forward by Butler to seize the railroad at that point. The Confederates “jumped off the platform cars upon which they were borne, the [Union] brigade . . . was in view, some thousand yards off, across an open field, advancing in line of battle, and supported by artillery . . . a brisk action ensued. The [Union brigade] made two direct attacks, and, after a second repulse, at nightfall withdrew.”⁵ “Thus were Peters-

¹ Grant to Meade, April 9, 1864, Personal Memoirs, vol. ii. p. 135.

² Grant to Butler, April 2, 1864, Butler’s Book, p. 630; War Records, Serial No. 95, p. 15.

³ Grant to Stanton, November 12, 1863, Chattanooga to Petersburg, p. 15.

⁴ Grant to Halleck, July 1, 1864, *ibid.* p. 29.

⁵ Roman, Beauregard, vol. ii. p. 552.

burg and Richmond barely saved by the opportune presence and gallant conduct of Hagood's command. It was upon that occasion that General Butler's forces were baffled and beaten off in their attempt to seize the Richmond railroad above Petersburg."¹ "The authorities at Richmond were now in a state of great excitement. The enemy had been repulsed on the Richmond railroad, and, to all appearance, had abandoned his original intention of investing Petersburg; but where he would next attempt to strike was the all-absorbing question."² At this juncture Beauregard had not yet arrived from Weldon; nor were there 3,000 men all told south of Walthall Junction, or available for the defence of Petersburg. The key to the whole military situation was unprotected. "Meanwhile troops were hastily called for from all quarters," and on the 10th Beauregard arrived, with the first body of reinforcements. The golden opportunity was rapidly passing. On the evening of the 9th Generals Gillmore and Smith, being then at Swift's Creek, about four miles north of Petersburg, united in a written communication to General Butler suggesting that the whole command should be directed on Petersburg instead of Richmond, as previously agreed. They claimed that "all the work of cutting the [rail]road, and perhaps capturing the city, can be accomplished in one day." Refusing even to consider the suggestion, General Butler, the same evening, returned a reply beginning as follows:—

"GENERALS,— While I regret an infirmity of purpose which did not permit you to state to me, when I was personally present, the suggestion which you made in your written note, but left me to go to my head-quarters under the impression that another and far different purpose was advised by you, I shall not yield to the written suggestions, which imply a change of plan made within thirty minutes after I left you. Military affairs cannot be carried on, in my judgment, with this sort of vacillation. The information I have received from the Army of the Potomac convinces me that our demonstration should be toward Richmond, and I shall in no way order a crossing of the Appomattox for the purpose suggested in your note."³

The date of this correspondence (May 9) is important. The battle of the Wilderness had been fought on May 5th and 6th, that of Spottsylvania was to begin on May 10th, and not until

¹ Roman, Beauregard, vol. ii. p. 198.

² *Ibid.* p. 199.

³ War Records, Serial No. 68, p. 35.

the 12th was the famous assault made on Lee's salient. The Confederate army was hard pressed. To what extent at just this juncture would sudden tidings of the capture of Petersburg, and the consequent severing of his line of southern sea-coast communication, have affected Lee's mind and the entire strategic situation? And it was just then that Butler, contemptuously and insolently ignoring the recommendations of his two subordinates, allowed Beauregard to establish himself at Petersburg, while the Army of the James made "a demonstration" toward Richmond! In his official report of the whole campaign Grant subsequently said of this "demonstration" that "the time thus consumed lost to us the benefit of the surprise and capture of Richmond and Petersburg, enabling, as it did, Beauregard to collect his loose forces in North and South Carolina, and bring them to the defence of those places."¹ The occasion was great, and Beauregard showed himself equal to it. Rapidly concentrating his scattered and scanty command, he, on the 15th, assumed the offensive. The next day (16th) he attacked Butler at Drewry's Bluff. "Butler's army was driven back, hemmed in, and reduced to comparative impotency, though not captured. The danger threatening Richmond was, for the time being, averted."²

At that time the Army of the Potomac was fighting at Spottsylvania fiercely and futilely, and not until June 3d, a fortnight later, did the slaughter of Cold Harbor occur. The great opportunity of May 9th, pointed out to Butler by his lieutenants, had been allowed wholly to escape; Lee's rear and communications were secure; Butler was safely "bottled up"; the Army of the Potomac, sorely crippled, had sustained losses as heavy as they were unnecessary; Grant's whole plan of campaign had gone to pieces. Had Butler on May 9th, correctly taking in the military situation, complied with the suggestion of his two corps commanders, Petersburg must have fallen into his hands; Lee would perforce have been compelled to fall back on Richmond; the Cold Harbor assaults would not have occurred; and all subsequent operations would have been other than they were.

Prior to this, May 7th, General Butler had written a

¹ War Records, Serial No. 95, p. 19.

² Roman, Beauregard, vol. ii. p. 209.

letter marked "Confidential" to Senator Wilson of Massachusetts, then on the Senate Military Committee, beginning thus: "My Dear Sir:—I must take the responsibility of asking you to bring before the Senate at once the name of General Gillmore, and have his name rejected by your body." Nominated for promotion to the rank of Major-General, the nomination of General Gillmore was then pending.¹ Under such circumstances the state of affairs in the Army of the James not unnaturally became in May so unsatisfactory that General Halleck at the request of General Grant sent (May 21st) Generals Meigs and Barnard to investigate. On the 24th they gave it as their opinion that "an officer of military experience and knowledge [should be placed] in command. . . . General Butler . . . has not experience and training to enable him to direct and control movements in battle. . . . General Butler evidently desires to retain command in the field. If his desires must be gratified, withdraw Gillmore, place Smith in command of both corps under the supreme command of Butler. . . . You will thus have a command which will be a unit, and General Butler will probably be guided by Smith, and leave to him the suggestions and practical execution of army movements ordered. Success would be more certain were Smith in command untrammelled, and General Butler remanded to the administrative duties of the departments."²

Difficulties naturally suggested themselves to the adoption of the course thus recommended. General Gillmore was relieved of his command early in June,³ and the ill-feeling between Butler and Smith culminated, June 21st, in a characteristic and extremely sharp correspondence,⁴ as a result of which General Smith requested to be relieved of the command of the Eighteenth Corps. Then followed one of the most extraordinary and inexplicable episodes of the war. Grant wrote (July 1) to Halleck, advising him of the situation. He said: "I regret the necessity of asking for a change of commanders here, but General Butler, not being a soldier by education or experience, is in the hands of his subordinates

¹ Butler's Book, pp. 644, 1065.

² War Records, Serial No. 69, p. 178.

³ Butler's Book, p. 679.

⁴ War Records, Serial No. 81, pp. 299-301; From Chattanooga to Petersburg, pp. 28, 155, 186-188.

in the execution of all orders military." Grant, however, hesitated "to recommend his [Butler's] retirement."¹ This brought out a most suggestive reply (July 3) from Halleck. In it he said: "It was foreseen from the first that you would eventually find it necessary to relieve General B. on account of his total unfitness to command in the field, and his generally quarrelsome character."² The Chief of Staff then went on to discuss the several dispositions which might be made of Butler, significantly pointing out the danger to be apprehended from "his talent at political intrigue, and his facilities for newspaper abuse." He finally suggested: "Why not leave General Butler in the local command of his department, including North Carolina, Norfolk, Fort Monroe, Yorktown, &c., and make a new army corps of the part of the Eighteenth under Smith?" The letter closed with a sentence indicative of the personal apprehension General Butler seemed to excite in the breasts of those put in any position antagonistic to him. The official Chief of Staff said: "As General Butler claims to rank me, I shall give him no orders wherever he may go, without the special direction of yourself or the Secretary of War." Three days later, July 6th, Grant wrote to Halleck: "Please obtain an order assigning the troops of the Department of Virginia and North Carolina serving in the field to the command of Maj. General W. F. Smith, and order Major General Butler, commanding department, to his head-quarters, Fortress Monroe." In accordance with this request, General Order No. 225 was at once issued. Curiously enough the original order, forwarded both to Butler and Smith,³ read that "Maj. Gen. Smith is assigned by the President to the command of the corps," etc.; in the order as formally made public the words "by the President" do not appear. This order, though in conformity with the recommendation of Generals Meigs and Barnard of six weeks before (May 24), was highly objectionable to General Butler. Immediately on receipt of it at Bermuda Hundred he rode over to the head-quarters of General Grant, and asked if "this was his act and his desire." Grant replied: "But I don't want this." Colonel Mordecai afterwards wrote: "Gen'l Butler

¹ War Records, Serial No. 81, p. 559.

² *Ibid.* p. 598.

³ Butler's Book, p. 695; From Chattanooga to Petersburg, p. 33.

returned to camp about dusk, as I recall it, and, as he dismounted from his horse, remarked to a number of his staff officers who were near him, 'Gentlemen, the order will be revoked to-morrow.'"¹ Not only was the order revoked, but General Butler's field command was extended so as to include the Nineteenth Corps, while General Smith was "relieved from the command of the Eighteenth Army Corps, and [directed to] proceed to New York, and await further orders."²

As respects the details of what transpired at the interview above referred to, General James H. Wilson, whose relations at the time and subsequently were intimate with both General Grant and Smith, wrote in 1904 as follows, in that Memoir of "Baldy" Smith already referred to:—

"It must be confessed that Grant's explanations of his later attitude towards Smith, and of the reasons for relieving him and restoring Butler to command, were neither full nor always stated in the same terms. He ignores the subject entirely in his memoirs, but it so happens that Mr. Dana, then Assistant Secretary of War, was sitting with General Grant when Butler, clad in full uniform, called at headquarters, and was admitted. Dana describes Butler as entering the General's presence with a flushed face and a haughty air, holding out the order relieving him from command in the field, and asking: 'General Grant, did you issue this order?' To which Grant in a hesitating manner replied: 'No, not in that form.' Dana, perceiving at this point that the subject under discussion was an embarrassing one, and that the interview was likely to be unpleasant, if not stormy, at once took his leave, but the impression made upon his mind by what he saw while present was that Butler had in some measure 'cowed' his commanding officer. What further took place neither General Grant nor Mr. Dana has ever said. Butler's Book, however, contains what purports to be a full account of the interview, but it is to be observed that it signally fails to recite any circumstance of an overbearing nature."³

The disposition of commands made in Special Order No. 62, above referred to, continued in force until the Wilmington expedition and the famous powder-boat explosion of the following December. During the months intervening much had happened. July, 1864, came about during one of the most depressing, if not the most depressing, period of the whole

¹ Chattanooga to Petersburg, p. 189.

² Special Orders No. 62, July 19, 1864; Butler's Book, p. 1087.

³ Life and Services of W. F. Smith, pp. 112, 113.

struggle. Grant's movement against Richmond and Lee's army had failed, after excessive loss of life; Sherman's movement against Atlanta had not yet succeeded; Washington was threatened from the valley of the Shenandoah; a presidential election was immediately impending; the country at large was in a state of extreme discouragement; the administration and the generals in the field stood in manifest fear of Butler's "talent for political intrigue and his facilities for newspaper abuse." Six months later the whole aspect of affairs had undergone a complete and, indeed, almost magical change. Grant, it is true, was still held in firm check before Petersburg; but Sherman had marched through Georgia and captured Savannah; Sheridan had won his victories in the valley; Lincoln had been re-elected; the Confederacy was believed to be in extremities. Under these circumstances that might safely be done which in July had seemed to involve a political risk. Accordingly, on January 4, 1865, Grant wrote to the Secretary of War: "I am constrained to request the removal of Maj. Gen. B. F. Butler from the command of the Department of Virginia and North Carolina. I do this with reluctance, but the good of the service requires it. In my absence General Butler necessarily commands, and there is a lack of confidence felt in his military ability, making him an unsafe commander for a large army. His administration of the affairs of his department is also objectionable."¹ Three days later (January 7) the following was issued from the War Department:—

"General Orders No. 1.

"I. By direction of the President of the United States, Maj. Gen. Benjamin F. Butler is relieved from the command of the Department of North Carolina and Virginia. . . .

"II. Major-General Butler on being relieved will repair to Lowell, Mass., and report by letter to the Adjutant-General of the Army."

Of General Butler as a field officer in active military service General W. F. Smith wrote to General Grant, after asking to be relieved from further service in the Department of Virginia and North Carolina: "I want simply . . . to ask you how you can place a man in command of two army corps, who is as helpless as a child on the field of battle and as visionary as

¹ War Record, Serial No. 96, p. 29.

an opium-eater in council?"¹ Of the same commander, Admiral David D. Porter wrote to the Secretary of the Navy, December 29, 1864, immediately after the withdrawal of the first expedition against Wilmington, subsequently to the powder-boat fiasco of December 24: "If this temporary failure succeeds in sending General Butler into private life, it is not to be regretted."²

Mr. CHARLES C. SMITH communicated the following remarks on the Rev. Dr. Pierce's Memoirs, with the accompanying extracts.

At several meetings of the Society during the last twenty years I have communicated selections from the manuscript Memoirs of Rev. Dr. John Pierce of Brookline, from 1809 to 1849 a member of the Society, which were given to us by his last will, and came into our possession nearly half a century ago.³ These selections were received with favor, and the wish has been expressed several times that further selections might be printed. Accordingly, during the summer vacation I have been carefully through the volumes to see just how far this might be desirable, and whether one or more volumes of Collections might not be made, to follow the volumes relating to the eighteenth century recently published. I am sorry to say that the hope that this could be done has been disappointed; and my examination has fully confirmed the decided and emphatic judgment of our predecessors, that a publication of the whole or even a large part of the Memoirs ought not to be attempted. Among the reasons which led to this opinion was, no doubt, the fact that much which Dr. Pierce recorded was not within his own knowledge, but was based on information received from others and afterward found to be incorrect, as he noted in the margin of his Memoirs. Added to this was probably the not less obvious fact that the "Memoirs" was in

¹ Chattanooga to Petersburg, p. 37; War Records, Serial No. 81, p. 595.

² Butler's Book, p. 1123.

³ See 2 Proceedings, vol. iii. pp. 40-52, "Journey to Providence and New Haven, 1795"; vol. v. pp. 167-263, "Some Notes on the Commencements at Harvard University, 1803-1848"; vol. ix. pp. 110-143, "Some Notes on the Anniversary Meetings of the Phi Beta Kappa Society, Alpha of Massachusetts, 1803-1843"; *ibid.*, pp. 143-157, "President Kirkland"; vol. x. pp. 392-403, "Anniversaries at Plymouth, 1820 and 1845"; 7 Mass. Hist. Coll., vol. v. pp. 392-394*n.*, "Character of Rev. Eliphalet Porter, D.D."

no sense a diary or journal, but was rather a commonplace book and a journal combined. No part of it can have been written at the time to which the entry refers, but in the form in which it now exists it was copied from notes made at an earlier period, and not always correctly copied, or was written largely from memory. In it are numerous anecdotes of Americans or Englishmen, many of which are printed elsewhere; copies of letters which he had received or written; documents relating to church troubles, mainly from printed pamphlets; church covenants; characters of deceased classmates or ministers, not always sympathetic in tone; accounts of temperance meetings and celebrations; long classified lists of persons whom he saw on public occasions which it would not be of interest to perpetuate in print; and even sermons copied at length from the original manuscripts. To this latter class belong eighteen or nineteen of his own sermons,¹ one by Rev. Leonard Withington of Newburyport, one by Rev. Dr. Osgood of Medford, one by Rev. Mr. Motte of Boston, one by an unnamed minister of Washington, D. C., one by his son-in-law, Rev. Thomas B. Fox, and two by Rev. Dr. Channing.² Dr. Pierce was a most assiduous attendant at the Thursday Lecture in Boston, and he often left other meetings that he might hear this sermon. He was present at the lecture more than eighteen hundred times, and of many of the discourses he has given abstracts, usually very short and covering only the heads of discourse or detached phrases which had interested him.³ He also attended one hundred and forty-one ordinations or installations, — “77 on Council; 64 not on Council; 45 in Boston; 96 elsewhere.” Of the services on these occasions he has given more or less full accounts, carefully noting how many minutes were occupied by each part, and whether the prayers were in his opinion “devout and appropriate” or not. For a generation which attaches much less importance to sermons than did our grandfathers these meagre reports would hardly tend

¹ A manuscript volume of early sermons by Dr. Pierce, 1800–1811, is in the Waterston library.

² One of Dr. Channing's sermons was preached after the death of Miss Anna Cabot Lowell, some of whose letters are printed in 2 *Proceedings*, vol. xviii, pp. 302–317. It is a very good specimen of Dr. Channing's pulpit discourses, but does not contain any biographical details or strictly personal references.

³ It is a tradition among the oldest members of the Society that noon was fixed for the hour of the Society's meetings in order to accommodate those members who wished to attend the Thursday Lecture.

to edification. On the other hand, though he was a member of this Society for forty years, and our records show that he was very constant in his attendance at the meetings, there is not one word about what was here said or done. In the same year in which he was made a member of this Society he was chosen a Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, and he is equally reticent as to what took place at their meetings.

Dr. Pierce comprised his Memoirs in eighteen small quarto volumes, of about five hundred pages each. Included in this enumeration is one volume lettered "Memorabilia," of which only a part is in his own hand, and of which a large part consists of blank leaves. To many of the volumes is prefixed a title-page,—"Memoirs By John Pierce, V Congregational Minister of Brookline, Massachusetts. . . . 'Historia, quoquo modo scripta, delectat.' Pliny." To this Dr. Pierce added on the title-page of Vol. I. New Series, two other mottoes,— "Parvum parva docent; sed inest sua gratia parvis." "'Pleraque eorum, quæ referam, parva forsitan et levia memoriter videri, non nescius sum.' Tacitus." At the beginning of that volume Dr. Pierce wrote as follows:—

The origin of these Memoirs is the following:

I began while member of Harvard University to write certain memoranda. The taste for this species of writing I probably inherited from my maternal ancestors by the name of Blake. My great-grandfather James Blake wrote a minute history of Dorchester, his native town, which I have transcribed in my family records.¹ He also left a manuscript volume containing a survey and projections of the various farms in Dorchester.

After taking minutes more or less particular of passing events in sheets stitched together, I procured a bound volume, and began on 1 January, 1806, to make a more formal record than I had before attempted. Proceeding some way, it occurred to me that I would transcribe into the same volume what I had written on loose papers, beginning with the week of anniversaries in Boston in 1803, so that my first ten volumes extend over a period of precisely forty years. Beyond this period I never expected to proceed. But though on the borders of three score years and ten, as my health remains so firm, I have concluded to prolong my Memoirs so long as God shall continue the ability for such a service.

¹ No. Two of Collections of the Dorchester Antiquarian & Histor. Socy, down to 1750. First published in Boston by David Clapp, Jr. in 1846.—*Marginal Note by Rev. Dr. Pierce.*

I intend that all these volumes, lettered on the back *Memoirs*, shall be deposited by my executor or administrator, be they more or fewer, in the Library of the Massachusetts Historical Society. My reasons are that this is the place expressly designed for such deposits, where they will be kept most safely and can be consulted most conveniently. Were they left to my family, it is probable that they would ere long be scattered, defaced, and lost. But in a public library where no manuscripts are allowed to be taken away they stand the best chance of preservation.

These *Memoirs* are not such as I could desire, being written without alterations or amendments as the events which they relate transpired. I doubt not that many errors may be detected, and that many of the records may savor of the prejudices and partial judgments of their writer. But such as they are, they are bequeathed without reserve to the Massachusetts Historical Society by one of its devoted members.

JOHN PIERCE.

3 June, 1843.

At the beginning of the last volume, "*Memorabilia*," the contents of which are of a very miscellaneous character, is the following memorandum: —

After having by Will bequeathed my *Memoirs* to the Massachusetts Historical Society, it was suggested to me by a friend that without some special provision they would be liable to abuse by unauthorized persons resorting thither, transcribing and garbling some portions, and publishing them in a way which might possibly do injury to my honest intentions and hurt the feelings of some survivors of my family. Accordingly I sought an interview with the Hon. James Savage, President of the Society, who prepared for my security from such perversions the following paper.

Paper prepared by Hon. James Savage for Pierce's Memoirs.

BROOKLINE, 27 April, 1849.

The Rev. John Pierce of this town having this day expressed to me his affection towards the Massachusetts Historical Society, of which he is one of the earliest members, and mentioned that he had provided in his last Will for the destination of certain volumes of manuscript *Memoirs*, 18 or more in number, unto said Society's Library, one of the rules of which he knew was that no manuscript could be allowed to go from the room of said Library, and yet he felt some anxiety lest an unwise curiosity in visitors at the Library, or in members of said Society, should be indulged by copying & publishing any trifling anecdote or reflection upon some person or transaction that might stand well enough in its general connection with the whole matter, but give offence

or raise misapprehension when taken singly, I therefore, as President of said Society, do faithfully promise that the said Society shall and will either pass an order or vote that no extract in writing shall be permitted to be taken from either of said volumes by any member of said Society, or visitor at said Library, within the period of four years from the delivery of the said volumes at the said Library by the Executor of said last Will, or that in default thereof I will receive the said volumes, and not permit them to be seen by any body nor read any part thereof during the said term of time.¹

JAMES SAVAGE.

While it would be undesirable to print any considerable part of the Memoirs in the Collections, it is true that in the volumes there are many things from which a selection may from time to time be made for insertion in the Proceedings; but as Dr. Pierce had a great fondness for gossip, matters not within his own knowledge ought always to be omitted. In many instances a censorious tone finds expression in the written record which, it is believed, was never noticed in personal intercourse. Without a spark of genius, with little imagination or sentiment, with no eloquence in speech or writing, — a plain “matter-of-fact person,” as he was accustomed to describe himself, — he was universally known and loved. One who knew him well, and whose characterization of him I just now adopted, wrote: “We suppose that there was hardly a man in Massachusetts whose person was known to so many individuals in the State.”²

In the Memoirs are some incidental references to the Historical Society which are worth copying. In a notice of the Hon. Thomas L. Winthrop, Dr. Pierce writes: —

¹ Dr. Pierce died August 24, 1849. After his death the volumes, by permission of the Society, remained in the custody of his widow until her death. They were received at the Library of the Society in February, 1859.

² For a well-considered and just estimate of Dr. Pierce, see an article, by Rev. Dr. George Putnam, in the *Christian Examiner*, vol. xlvii. pp. 447-455. See also Rev. Dr. Andrew P. Peabody's “Harvard Graduates whom I have known,” pp. 27-41. Dr. Pierce's peculiarities were the occasion of much innocent mirth among his ministerial brethren. When quite a young man I went to Brookline to the ordination of his colleague. In coming into Boston in the omnibus, it so happened that I sat next to the Rev. Dr. Parkman, father of our late eminent associate. In the course of a pretty general conversation Dr. Parkman with a twinkle in his eye quoted Paul's Epistle to Titus, as applicable to Dr. Pierce, — “But avoid foolish questions, and genealogies, and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable and vain.”

"He has been President of the American Antiquarian Society for nine years; and since 1835, when Judge John Davis resigned the office he has been President of the Massachusetts Historical Society. He has been generous in his donations to these and other literary and benevolent institutions of the day. The meetings of the Historical Society he uniformly attended; and every month was in the habit of inviting the members present at the meetings to a most sumptuous entertainment in his own house."

At that time the membership was limited to sixty, and the average attendance was about twelve or fifteen. I am not aware that any of Mr. Winthrop's predecessors had set a precedent for this large hospitality, and it has not been followed by any of his successors.

Under date of May 29, 1843, Dr. Pierce writes:—

At XI A. M. the Massachusetts Historical Society walked in procession from their rooms in Tremont street to the First Church.¹ Present, John Q. Adams, Nathan Appleton, Charles F. Adams, George Bancroft, Josiah Bartlett, *John Codman, D.D.*, John Davis, Isaac P. Davis, *George E. Ellis, Joseph B. Felt, Dr. Francis*, S. P. Gardner, F. C. Gray, Wm. Gibbs, Samuel Hoar, *Dr. Jenks, Dr. Lowell, Dr. Lamson, Wm. P. Lunt*, N. Mitchell, John Pickering, Wm. H. Prescott, *J. Pierce*, Pres. Quincy, *S. Ripley*, James Savage, Jared Sparks, George Ticknor, Charles W. Upham, Joseph Willard, Joseph E. Worcester, D. A. White, R. C. Winthrop, *Alexander Young.*² 34. These were accompanied by delegates from other Historical Societies. This was the second Centennial Celebration of the confederation of the New England colonies.

We entered the church precisely at XI A. M.]

I. Voluntary on the Organ.

II. Prayer by Dr. Frothingham, of 8 minutes, well adapted to the occasion.

Psalm 107, New England version, 1640.

"Your thanks unto the Lord express;
Because that good is he;
Because his loving-kindnesses
Last to eternity.

¹ The First Church was then in Chauncy Place.

² Following the plan adopted in the Triennial Catalogues of Harvard College, in which the names of ministers were printed in italics, Dr. Pierce underscored the names of the clerical members of the Society who were present. The names of Mr. Sparks and Mr. Upham were not underscored.

"So say the Lord's redeemed, whom bought
He hath from enemies' hands;
And from the East and West hath brought,
From South and Northern lands.

"Then did they to Jehovah cry,
When they were in distress;
Who did them set at liberty
Out of their anguishes.

"O that men praise Jehovah would
For his great goodness then,
And for his wonders manifold
Unto the sons of men!"

III. Address by John Quincy Adams, of one hour and forty-three minutes. It was an elaborate production, read without glasses, many parts of which were uttered with great energy.

Psalm 44 of the same version was sung to St. Martin's.

"We with our ears have heard, O God;
Our fathers have us told,
What works thou wroughtest in their days,
Even in the times of old.

"For by their sword they did not get
The land's possession;
Nor was it their own arm that did
Work their salvation.

"But thy right hand, thine arm also,
Thy countenance's light;
Because that of thine own good will,
Thou didst in them delight."

The benediction by Dr. Frothingham.

The house was respectably filled; the galleries principally by ladies. The broad-aisle pews were reserved for the Society and its guests.

There was no dinner; but in the evening the members of the Society and a large number of others met at the mansion of the President, Hon. James Savage, where I was introduced to several members of kindred Societies.¹

Dr. Pierce was indefatigable in his attendance at the Exhibitions in Harvard College and at the visitations to the Divinity School; but his notes on them have far less interest and value than his notes on the Harvard Commencements and on the

¹ With this account it may be interesting to compare that given by Mr. Adams himself. See *Memoirs of J. Q. Adams*, vol. x. pp. 378, 379.

Phi Beta Kappa Anniversaries. His account of the graduating exercises of the Divinity School in 1836 is, however, worth reproducing on account of three of the class, George E. Ellis, Theodore Parker, and John S. Dwight, the latter of whom did so much for the advancement of musical taste in this community.

Wednesday, 20 July, at the XXth annual visitation of the Divinity School, at Cambridge, every one of which I have attended. The day was fine.

The exercises commenced precisely at X with a prayer of 13 minutes by Prof. Palfrey.

Dissertations.

I. The imputed tendency of Biblical studies to impair the devotional spirit, by Wm. Silsbee, of Salem, 21 min.

II. The Gnostic philosophy, and allusions to it in the New Testament. Theodore Parker of Lexington. 19 min.

Mr. Parker has had no collegiate education; yet his attainments in the School have been quite respectable. He has made such advances in the Hebrew language as to teach it in College. His dissertation evinced a thorough knowledge of his subject, written with purity, and delivered with simplicity.

III. The preacher's estimation of his work, expressed in this line of Herbert, "The pulpit is his joy and theme." Abiel Abbot Livermore, Wilton, N. H. 21 min.

This was a sound composition, in exact resemblance of the style of the eminent divine to whom he refers.

An anthem was then sung by the students, "O praise God in his holiness."

IV. The connexion of the Christian doctrine with Christian morality. Oliver Capen Everett. 25.

V. The history, character, and uses of the Latin Vulgate, and its influence on the formation of the received text of the N. T. Geo. Edward Ellis. 21.

This was an ingenious discussion of the subject, written with much simplicity and perspicuity, and delivered in a very appropriate manner.

VI. The proper character of poetry & music for public worship. John Sullivan Dwight. 33.

This was a charming composition and happily delivered. Some of his positions were perhaps exaggerated, and some might admit a difference of opinion. But as a whole it was a highly acceptable performance.

Anthem, "Holy, holy, holy L. G. of Sabaoth."

VII. The duty of a pastor in respect to the intellectual improvement of his charge. Richard Thomas Austin. 24.

The least meritorious production of the day.

VIII. The encouragements of the ministry at the present time. Samuel Page Andrews. 20.

Hymn, "Father of light, conduct my feet," &c.

The services as a whole were better than common. Silsbee, Livermore, Everett, Ellis, Dwight, Andrews are Cambridge scholars. Austin was of Bowdoin College. He has lately had his name altered from Seiders to Austin, the name of the lady to whom he is engaged. Parker, though not from any College, yet has made improvements which may well put to the blush many who are thus educated.

This was the fullest audience ever witnessed on a similar occasion. The company at dinner was the largest I have witnessed. At table Professor Chase, of the Baptist Institution, Newton, asked the blessing. Rev. Dr. Gray returned thanks.

It grieved me to see so much wine provided, and to observe so many clergymen drink so freely of it. When will this stumbling block to the temperance reformation be frowned into darkness!

At a little before IV the Philanthropic Society held their annual meeting, Oliver Capen Everett in the chair. Dr. Ware, Jr., opened the meeting with an appropriate prayer of 3 minutes. Sears, Secretary,¹ read a report, by which it appeared that during the year the Society has holden 19 meetings and made 13 reports.

I. On Sabbath Schools. The great obstacles to their usefulness were considered to be the immature and mechanical manner in which they were conducted.

II. On Mobs. The principal causes are uninformed popular sympathies; the natural tendencies of Associations.

It has for several years been popular since Dr. Channing gave the cue to exclaim against Associations, when most of the good done at Cambridge is by means of Associations, and at the very time when these Cambridge declaimers are associating to effect their purposes. In a word they have formed an Association to put down Associations. In like manner, since Dr. Walker has been riding his hobby of our spiritual nature, this is the fashionable topic with the young men of the School.

III. On Slavery, in which it was maintained that there is no necessary incompatibility between Colonization and Abolition principles.

IV. On School Teachers.

V. On Missions. This must have been a somewhat speculative

¹ Edmund H. Sears of the Junior Class — a member of the Historical Society from 1857 to 1876.

subject to a School which does nothing toward foreign missions, and whose pupils have a great dread of settling far from home, even in their own country, and for the most part desert their border situations whenever they can find an opening near the place of their nativity.

VI. On the Temperance Reform. This must have received but a feeble impulse from supporters who will not relinquish their wine, cider, strong beer, and other intoxicating drinks.

VII. On Catholicism. Catholicity would have been a less equivocal and more descriptive term.

VIII. On Swedenborgianism. It was summarily decided by these young doctors that the miracles in the system are not properly supported; and that the discriminating doctrines are not sustained by reason or scripture.

IX. Associations,—dangerous!!! & yet nothing great or good effected without them; opposed also by a formal Association!!!!

X. On Physical Education.

XI. On Theology in Germany. Rationalists & Mystics.

XII. On Esthetics.

XIII. On Prisons.

To this report succeeded discussions.

I. The subject proposed was on the means of increasing sympathy among Christians.

1. The Rev. A. B. Muzzey of Cambridgeport spoke 10 minutes.

He despaired of union with the Orthodox, because they would not allow Unitarians to be Christians. He thought that the best way to convince them of their error was to exhibit the Christian life and spirit.

2. Rev. Joshua Himes spoke 16 minutes, so scatteringly that I could gather nothing of what he said.

3. Rev. J. B. Thompson¹ of Salem spoke 12 minutes, with as little point.

4. Mr. Fanning of the Christian denomination, Nashville, Tenn., spoke 15 minutes altogether in general.

II. A second topic was proposed,—What is wanting to render public religious services more effectual?

After waiting some time for some one to arise the Rev. Mr. Babidge of Pepperrell spoke 11 minutes on the former subject. He dwelt principally on the need of sympathy which clergymen in his situation experienced, and urged the necessity of extending sympathy toward them.

¹ This is one of the instances, not uncommon in the later volumes of the Memoirs, in which Dr. Pierce made a mistake in a name. It should be James W. Thompson. He was a graduate of Brown University and of the Harvard Divinity School, and was successively settled at South Natick, Salem, and Jamaica Plain. He was held in high esteem by his contemporaries.

After a dead silence for some time Dr. Ware, Jr., arose and moved to this effect, that gentlemen desired to speak on such occasions consider it their duty to express their sentiments. Dr. Lowell objected on the ground that the persons to whom application was made might have special reasons for declining. While Dean Palfrey was preparing to modify the motion, Dr. Walker of Charlestown arose and suggested that the subject proposed was not the most suitable. Much had been said about union. He believed that it could not be forced, and that the only union worth anything came unasked, unsought, by the voluntary agreement of kindred souls.

I was never more impressed, at the whole of this meeting, with the conviction that it is a most awkward thing to speak on any subject merely because you are desired to say something, and not because you have anything to say. I should pronounce the whole a failure.

[Here follow the names of 71 persons present on this occasion.]

In 20 years 155 have left the Divinity School. Of these 109 have been ordained. Present incumbents 59 in the State + 23 out do. = 82. The past year 5 ordained in the State + 1 out do. = 6. Now belong to Mass. Conv. Cong. ministers 56. There have been dismissed who yet preach, 17. Candidates from the School, not been set^d 25. Left preaching from various causes, 15. There have died $\frac{1}{11}$ nearly of the whole, viz. 14. Of these were 5 who had been ordained. From the School there has been Swedenborgian 1; Episcopal 1; Orthodox 1; Universalist 1; and 1 has been insane.

Present candidates who have not been ordained:

[Here follow 26 names.]

This afternoon I desire to communicate the account of a journey to Washington made by Dr. Pierce in 1812, a few months after the declaration of war between Great Britain and the United States. It is a characteristic example of his method in recording his personal recollections.

December, 1812. Journey to Washington.

Having been urgently invited by my brother Lewis Tappan to accompany him to the city of Washington, after mature deliberation I consented, and accordingly left Brookline 1 Dec. on Tuesday, and went into Boston. I spent the night at Boyden's, an old, wretched tavern near the Market, with a view of being near the stage, supposing that it started from this place. The accommodations were worse than I ever found before. No wonder if a foreigner, tarrying over night in Boston at such a place as this, should give the town a bad character for filthiness and disturbance in its publick houses.

2 Dec., Wednesday. Started before daylight in the Albany stage. Had one agreeable companion, who accompanied me to Leicester only. We breakfasted at Eaton's in Framingham, dined at Sykes's in Worcester, and lodged at Draper's in Brookfield. Nothing remarkable occurred this day. I could not but observe, and be unpleasantly affected with the sight, that at almost every tavern throughout my journey and homeward there were great numbers of petty officers and soldiers belonging to the new army who were loitering away their time, and who appeared to care for nothing but to drink their grog and to pursue some foolish sports which might whirl away their time. Were the cause unquestionably good for which they are employed, there would be less ground of anxiety. But when I could not but consider them as employed to further the views of the grand tyrant of Europe my heart sickened at the contemplation.

3 Dec., Thursday. Breakfasted at Mellen's in Belchertown, and arrived a little past noon at my father Tappan's in Northampton,¹ where I joined my brother Lewis, and where we were allowed an hour by the stage driver to dine with a family party. My daughter Elisabeth was rejoiced to see me, and I could not but regret so short an interview. We passed the night at Mills's in Worthington, an uncommonly neat and fine tavern.

4 Dec., Friday. We went to Pittsfield to breakfast in a sleigh. The towns through which we passed were for the most part very hilly. At Pittsfield tried in vain to find my old friend Rev. Wm. Allen.² After breakfast passed on in plain sight of Lebanon Springs, over the worst hill which I ever encountered, to Nassau, where we dined at a tavern kept by John Stoddard, a broken merchant from Northampton. Our next stage was to Albany, where we arrived a little after sunset, passing through Greenbush, in full sight of the quarters of Gen. Dearborn's army. We put up at Gregory's, a famous hotel in Albany. In the evening we found the lodgings of brother Arthur Tappan and wife with whom we had a very pleasant interview.

5 Dec., Saturday. We walked over the city. The streets were very dirty. We observed great numbers of old Dutch houses with their ends toward the street. The Yankees, however, outnumber them at present. We visited Ames's portrait room, where we saw the likenesses of several of their most respectable characters. We went to Cook's reading room, a convenient place to read papers and consult

¹ Dr. Pierce was twice married. His second wife, to whom he was married in 1802, was Lucy, daughter of Benjamin Tappan of Northampton.

² Rev. William Allen, D.D., was born in Pittsfield Jan. 2, 1784, graduated at Harvard College in 1802, settled at Pittsfield in 1810, and died at Northampton July 16, 1868. He was successively President of Dartmouth College and President of Bowdoin College, but will be longest remembered for his well-known Biographical Dictionary.

maps. We here drank waters from the Ballstown and Congress springs. We observed a handsome new Dutch Reformed Church. I called on Judge Kent with a letter from Pres. Kirkland. He received me with great familiarity. He is a very plain, social, sensible, unaffected man. We saw Gov. Tompkins's house and Gen. Stephen Van Renssalaer, the patroon's, a little out of the city.

6 Dec., Lord's Day. Went in the morning to hear the Rev. Dr. Bradford. His clerk began the service by reading the twentieth chapter of Exodus, and then reading a psalm which he sang. Then Dr. B. prayed 15 minutes. I remarked this peculiarity among his people (Dutch Reformed) that they all sat during prayer, on what principle I cannot conceive. He preached a plain, sensible discourse from Acts xi. 26, "The disciples were called Christians first at Antioch." He is a tall, elegant man, a little short of 30 years old. He was the son of the Rev. Eben. Bradford of Rowley, and was educated at Providence, R. I. His mother is sister to Dr. Green, formerly of Philadelphia, now Pres. of Princeton College, by whom he was educated for the pulpit. In describing Christians he represented that they must believe in the divinity of Christ and in the atonement; but in which of the numerous senses adopted by professed Christians he did not designate. In one part of his sermon he inveighed against party names and against superstition and bigotry. His sermon was 38 minutes long. His style was for the most part pure; but he used in prayer the terms sin-hating, sin-forgiving. In the afternoon we went to the old Presbyterian church, to hear Dr. Neil. Gamaliel S. Olds, a candidate, preached for him from Psalm xcvi. 1, "The Lord reigneth," &c. He was stiff and awkward in his manner; but he gave a sensible discourse on divine sovereignty. In the evening I called on Dr. B. and took tea with him. He then accompanied me to Dr. Neil's. At nine o'clock in the evening the steamboat unexpectedly arrived from New York. We had despaired of its coming on account of the cold weather, and had taken passage in the stage, but our advance money was refunded.

7 Dec, Monday. In the morning we called with sister Frances on Mr. Bleeker, her relation, and on Chancellor Lansing. At 2½ p. m. we started in the Paragon steamboat for Hudson. At 7½ we arrived at Athens opposite to Hudson. We spent the night in the boat. It is 175 feet long, and has fine rooms and elegant accommodations. We were now 30 miles from Albany.

8 Dec., Tuesday. We passed over to Hudson city; the east side of the river, where we put up at Gen. Pepon's tavern. Soon the Rev. John Chester called, and engaged me to preach an evening lecture. We accordingly went and took tea with him, and in the

evening I preached to a considerable congregation, from 1 Tim. i. 11, "The glorious gospel of the blessed God."

9 Dec., Wednesday. We walked over the city, examined the Academy; went up to the top of the high hill on which it stands, where we had a fine view of the Catskill mountains, Claverak, &c. We were introduced to Mr. Grosvenor, member elect of Congress, Mr. Elisha Williams, an elegant man and celebrated lawyer. I called also on John Swift, formerly from Roxbury, now deacon & elder of Mr. C.'s church. This morning there was great firing on receiving the news of the capture of the Macedonian by Com. Decatur in the United States.

At 2½ we started again in the steamboat, wind strong at N. W., having about 30 fellow passengers. It was pleasant to catch a view of elegant buildings and cultivated lands as we passed by them. We, however, went by some of the most interesting places by night.

10 Dec., Thursday, at 6½, by daylight, we arrived at the city of New York. Its appearance as we approached was quite interesting. The spires of churches, of which there are nearly 40, presented a delightful spectacle among the numerous houses and other buildings which arose to view. We were of course but 16 hours in sailing 130 miles.

We put up at Mrs. Keese's, a genteel house on Broadway, corner of Wall Street. After breakfast we called at the reading room; and I delivered letters. Called on Rev. Timo. Alden.¹ We visited the City Hall, a magnificent building. I was informed that it will cost a million of dollars. We saw the Mayor, De Witt Clinton, and two Aldermen trying criminals for petty offences. We went to the Museum, where were a variety of curiosities, natural and artificial. We walked round the Battery, bounded by North and by East river. It was truly melancholy to see the immense quantities of shipping lie useless at the wharves. They appeared not unlike to vast forests through which the fire had passed and left naked trunks of trees, the sad memorials of what they once were.

P. M., we went into every apartment in the City Hall. The Common Council chamber is one of the most elegant rooms in the known world. Bp. Cheverus informed me, on my return, that he never saw its equal in France or England. Round the room are hung elegant likenesses of most of their Governours.

¹ Rev. Timothy Alden, Jr., from May, 1808, to October, 1809, Librarian of the Historical Society, was born in Yarmouth, Mass., Aug. 28, 1771, graduated at Harvard College in 1794, in the class after Dr. Pierce, and died at Pittsburg, Penn., July 5, 1839. He was at one time President of Alleghany College, at Meadville, and is well known for his collection of American Epitaphs. See *Proceedings*, vol. i. *passim*; *Sprague's Annals of the American Pulpit*, vol. ii. pp. 449-454.

11 Dec., Friday. In the morning we rode to the State's prison, about 2. miles from our lodgings. It is a large and convenient place, surrounded by high and thick walls, on the top of which are sentry boxes at each corner, and sentries constantly on guard with arms. There were at this time five hundred prisoners. Various kinds of labour were going on. There was a general appearance of industry, neatness, and good order. In their chapel the clergymen of the city officiate in turns. I called on the Rev. William Harris, D.D., President of Columbia College, but he was from home. We next visited Paff's gallery of portraits, where we were highly gratified. The head of Grotius by Vandyke was truly interesting.

In the evening we attended the Rev. Dr. Mason's lecture preparatory to Communion.¹ His house, which is new, is singularly constructed. There is in front a large spacious porch, the width of the house. From this porch they enter upon the lower floor of the church by two doors which are in the direction of the side aisles. The pulpit is exactly in the middle between these two doors, and the back of it is on the porch. The pews, which are oblong, are on semi-circular arches, the centre of the pulpit being the radius. As you recede from the pulpit the rows of the pews gradually rise, till the last row becomes of the same height with the pulpit. The Dr. first read a psalm, which was sung from the barbarous Scotch version. He then prayed with fervour and interest 15 minutes. His sermon was from John v. 24, respecting passing from death unto life. The doctrine of the discourse, which went to establish total depravity, irresistible grace, and sudden conversion, seemed to be founded rather on the Scotch catechism than on the authority of the Bible. It was nearly an hour long, and was evidently an extempore effusion. Were I to judge of the Doctor by this specimen, I should not ascribe to him those pre-eminent talents which I have learned he possesses. I observed one young man in tears who I afterwards understood was one of his pupils in theology. After service I called and sat a short time with him. But as I came from a part of the country not famed for attachment to Scotch formularies of faith he appeared to treat me with coldness and distance very differently from the manner in which I saw him treated on his visit to Boston in the houses of my friends who differed equally from him in religious sentiments.

12 Dec., Saturday. I attended the worship of the Jews in their

¹ Rev. John M. Mason, D.D., was born in New York March 19, 1770, graduated at Columbia College in 1789, studied theology in Scotland, was settled over churches in New York, and was for a time President of Dickinson College. He died in his native city, Dec. 26, 1829. In his best days he had a great reputation as a pulpit orator. See Appleton's *Cyclopædia of American Biography*, vol. iv. pp. 245, 246.

synagogue in company with the Rev. Timo. Alden. The men occupy the lower floor. The women are in the gallery, which has a breast-work as high as their chins. The men wore white sashes; had wax candles burning; and went with great ceremony to the altar to take out a scroll on which was written their law. Their exercises, consisting of prayers and singing from the Psalms and recitations from the law, were performed by young and old altogether in the Hebrew language. They were very attentive to us; and finding that we could read Hebrew, they pointed out to us the places from which their services were taken.

After service we visited the Academy of Arts in a large building erected for Congress when they sat in New York. In the same building is the chamber of the New York Historical Society, the collections of which are far inferior to those of the M. H. S. Visited Columbia College. The Rev. Dr. Boden showed me the library of about 4,000 volumes, old and worn. Saw the different rooms where were the apparatus, &c., &c. The funds are small. The building is a long and ill-shapen stone edifice. At one end is a foundation for a wing, which they could never obtain money to finish. They have no catalogue of students or of graduates. Dr. Mason has been lately chosen Provost; and great expectations are entertained from this circumstance.

P. M. I called with Mr. Alden on Mr. Perrine, a Presbyterian minister, where I met Mr. Strong, another Presbyterian minister of the city.

13 Dec., Lord's Day. In the morning I went to Dr. Miller's church.¹ He preached from Isaiah liii. 6, "All we, like sheep, have gone," &c. It was a serious sermon on depravity, 45 minutes long, which had been evidently written & committed to memory. I communed with his church, consisting, I should suppose, of 140 members. He first made an address on the nature of the ordinance, without dismissing the assembly. A large table was spread in the front aisle which passes before the pulpit. As many of both sexes as could sit around it took their seats, and partook of the ordinance in both kinds. After this a hymn was given out and sung by those retiring from the table, and by another set approaching it. This ceremony took place 3 times; and at each time the ceremony was repeated with but little variation. This does not strike me as so properly communing together as is the custom in Congregational churches.

Dr. Miller merely asked me to officiate at one of the tables; and this

¹ Rev. Samuel Miller, D.D., was born in Dover, Del., Oct. 31, 1769, graduated at the University of Pennsylvania, and studied theology. From 1791 to 1813 he was settled in New York, and afterward was a professor in the Theological Seminary at Princeton, N. J., where he died Jan. 7, 1850. See Appleton's *Cyclopædia of American Biography*, vol. iv. p. 327.

was all the notice which he took of me, although I had a friendly letter of introduction from his old friend Dr. Eliot, although I had been in his company when he was at Boston, and although I at that time remained in the city 4 days. I am afraid that the consideration of my coming from Jerusalem occasioned this forbidding reserve.

P. M. I went to hear Dr. J. B. Romeyn, a popular Presbyterian. He is about 40 years old, and has a pleasant countenance and address. His text was II Cor. ii. 14, 15, "Unto the one we are a savour of death," &c. It was a very plain, unadorned, and unambitious discourse, delivered with great pathos, though without any motion of the hands. It was, I should judge, more than an hour long, yet a very full congregation appeared quite attentive through the whole. In his prayer he had this singular expression, "May we lay the hand of faith on the head of our substitute Jehovah Jesus!"

In the evening I went to Trinity Church, where was a large assembly of the gayest dressed people whom I ever saw at public worship. Prayers were read by Mr. Sayre, who, I observed, with others in the church bowed at the name of Jesus. Mr. How preached from Hebrews i. 1, 2, 3, on the Trinity. His arguments were very trite and inconclusive. He affected the orator by uncommon gesticulation.

14 Dec., Monday. We took the accommodation stage for Philadelphia. In passing through New Jersey, what was most observable was the level roads, red, clayey sand and soil, fine travelling, the appearance of good husbandry, and several beautiful towns and villages. The season past was a fine season for corn, though the crops in New England were generally so miserable. The most interesting places are Newark, Elizabethtown, Princeton, Brunswick, and Trenton. A steamboat regularly passes from New York on the bay up the Raritan to Brunswick. From this place there is a portage to Trenton where another steamboat passes to Philadelphia, 30 miles. This day we dined in Milton, and passed the night at Princeton. The roads were so badly cut up by the heavy travelling from Brunswick that we went very slowly the latter part of the way. Arriving at Princeton after 9 in the evening I could not see the College.

15 Dec., Tuesday. We arrived at Trenton to breakfast. I saw the place where the Hessians were captured in our Revolutionary War, and the bridge in passing which Washington was welcomed on his way to New York to take the Presidency of the U. S. by ladies dressed in white and with baskets of flowers. We went, however, over a new chain bridge, over which we passed under cover. The first object we perceive on the Pennsylvania side is the late residence of Gen. Moreau. The house was burnt about a year ago. The appearance indicates that it was a magnificent seat. We were told that he contemplates rebuilding it. We observed in passing that it is common in Pennsylvania to

gather corn from the husks in the field; to construct their ovens by themselves at a little distance from their habitations; to build most of their houses and even barns in the country of stone; and to have a large proportion of their hay without cover, exposed to the elements. The road from Trenton to Philadelphia is very fine. We had frequent and interesting views of the Delaware. In the Middle States the people *reckon*, as much as the Yankees *guess*. They much more generally confound the persons of verbs and nouns, &c., as "the *lands is* good," &c., &c. A well dressed and intelligent gentleman got into the stage when we were quite crowded, for he said he wanted to get into town *very badly*. Though we pay stage fare for 100 miles from New York to Philadelphia, yet they call it to Princeton 50 miles, thence to Trenton 10 miles, & thence to Philadelphia 30 miles = 90 from city to city.

We took lodgings at Mrs. Benson's, an elegant boarding house. After dinner we went into the warm bath. The water was so hot that we were made very languid, and were exceedingly exposed to taking cold. We went to see the elephant, and then we visited Peale's Museum, which, it being the evening before market day, was much crowded.

16 Dec., Wednesday. It being market day we went early into Market Street. This is a fine, wide, and commodious street, commencing at the Delaware and extending toward the Schuylkill. The market house, beginning at the Delaware, is half a mile long. The street is so wide that teams can conveniently pass each other on each side of the house. At the end of the market house the large waggons are ranged as near together as they can stand, each drawn by five and sometimes six horses. They often carry $4\frac{1}{2}$ tons in one waggon.

I was introduced to Mr. John Vaughan,¹ Mr. Taylor, and Mr. Edowes. Went into Dr. Staughton's new Baptist meeting. It is of a round form, having a covered baptistery in the middle of the broad aisle. Saw the Unitarian church, which is in a state of forwardness. Went to the Academy of Fine Arts. Saw many elegant statues. They are exhibited naked; yet we were told that nothing is more common than for ladies to go and see them, without, however, the company of men. The Pennsylvania Bank, the Philadelphia Bank, and the Masons' Hall are very elegant buildings of white marble.

P. M. We went to Beck's shot tower, near the Schuylkill. From the top of this, 166 feet, there is the best view of the city which you can find. I counted 254 steps, very steep in the ascent. Examined a curious steam engine which raises water from the Schuylkill to supply the city.

¹ John Vaughan, a younger brother of the more famous Benjamin Vaughan, Franklin's friend, was born in England Jan. 15, 1756, came to this country at an early age, and settled in Philadelphia where he died, Dec. 13, 1841. He was for many years Secretary of the American Philosophical Society.

Evening took tea at Mr. Buck's, a Hamburger, with Mrs. Nath. Higginson, aunt of Mrs. B. Several German ladies were there. After this Mrs. H. introduced me to Dr. Rush. He gave me this anecdote concerning Dr. Doddridge, communicated to him by Dr. Priestley. Dr. Doddridge once invited the famous Dr. James Foster on his travels through Northampton to preach for him. He accordingly preached in Dr. D.'s pulpit. This made a great hue and cry among the Orthodox. On Dr. D.'s going to London Mr. Buckland, bookseller in Paternoster Row, inquired of him concerning the fact. "Do you think," replied he with apparent seriousness, "that I would solicit the services of such a heretick?" This reply being carried to Dr. Foster, he says to the informant, "Do you ask Dr. D. from me, whether he did not invite me to preach for him, and whether I did not accordingly preach." These questions being put to Dr. D. he was exceedingly affected by a conviction of the duplicity which he had practised. Dr. Aikin, a pupil of Doddridge at the time of these transactions, gave Dr. Priestley this anecdote, and added that Dr. D. used to lay it to heart that he was guilty of such prevarication, so as to weep whenever the subject was started.

17 Dec., Thursday. In the morning Mr. James Taylor politely waited on us to the State's prison. We were conducted into its various apartments by Mr. Morris, a very pleasant and intelligent Quaker. There is the uniform appearance of uncommon neatness, industry, good order, and comfortable food and other accommodations. The number of convicts was 450. Few were kept together, to prevent as far as possible infection from evil examples. The only punishment which they inflict, besides reproof, is solitary confinement. There has been no instance of suicide; nor has there ever been an insurrection, although they have had but seven men, and these wholly without arms, to guard them. Their worship is conducted principally by Methodists. There is a larger and more commodious prison erecting a little out of the city. From this place we went to the Pennsylvania Hospital, a magnificent, neat, and charitable institution. Went into the museum attached to it, and saw the human frame in almost every state. The gardens around are very handsome. In the front there is a large brazen statue of Penn. We next visited the mint of the U. S. They were coining and milling half dollars. We then dined with Mr. John Vaughan, a bachelor, to whom I had letters. I was here introduced to the Abbé Correa, the most learned man that Portugal has produced. He has published several works, and is member of most of the learned institutions, both in Europe and America. Mr. Vaughan showed us after dinner, the library, museum, &c., of the American Philosophical Society. We went again into Peale's Museum. Saw the bones of the mammoth, a model of the machine for perpetual

motion, a curious optical fallacy in looking through complex mirrors. Mr. V. gave me this anecdote. When St. Pierre published his *Paul and Virginia*, a blooming young lady being delighted with the work determined to marry the author; and she accomplished her purpose by urging her own suit, though the disparity in their years was great. The Museum contains an immense collection of paintings, mostly by Peale, also numerous specimens of statues, birds, beasts, fishes, insects, reptiles, metals, minerals, coins, &c. It is visited by all ranks of people, as the fee for admission is but 25 cents. Visited the City Library left by an English gentleman. It is consulted gratis.

18 Dec., Friday. At 5 in the morning took passage in the Pilot stage with 6 others. Breakfasted at Chester in the tavern of Mr. Anderson, member of Congress. Dined at Elkton on Elk river. At sunset crossed the Susquehannah at Havre de Grace, and supped on canvas backed ducks, where we lodged. In this part of the country we pass no churches on the road. The common people almost universally appear idle and profane, and discover great want of common education. A decent looking man said, "I have never *went* to Baltimore by land." Another said he lived a *little piece* from such a place. We this day travelled 25 miles in the State of Delaware, passing through Wilmington, its capital. This is a town of some trade and of considerable importance. Most of their fences here are of hedge. Throughout this part of Delaware and the State of Maryland there are scarcely any bridges in the roads. They have very small barns, as the cattle are in the fields most of the winter.

19 Dec., Saturday. At a little past noon arrived at Gadsby's, a famous hotel in Baltimore. Next door to the bar-room is a barber's shop with four attendants. On arriving our names were entered in a book, and our room was shown us. Immediately a black servant presented himself who was always at our command while we tarried. Water is conveyed by pipes to an entry, where we wash with the most perfect convenience. After dinner went to see the first house in Gay Street occupied by Wagner the printer which was wholly demolished by an unprincipled mob.¹ Saw also the castle of the Spartan band, so called, in Charles Street, where Hanson and Wagner's friends, headed by Gen. Lee, so valiantly defended themselves. The doors and windows were broken in. Went next to the goal where such horrid scenes took place. Called on my old friend Eben. Wales and on Thomas Vose, with whom I took tea.

20 Dec., Lord's Day. Preached all day for Dr. Inglis, a Presby-

¹ The Baltimore riot, to which there are frequent references in the following pages, occurred in July, 1812. It was the direct consequence of the angry and excited state of political feeling everywhere prevalent at that time. See Hildreth's *History of the United States*, vol. vi. pp. 325-333; Henry Adams's *History of the United States*, vol. vi. pp. 405-409.

terian minister.¹ Had among my hearers Robert Smith, late Secretary of State, and family, Senator Sam. Smith's family, Gen. Stricker, John E. Hall, one of the Spartan band, &c., &c. By the influence of the Catholics in this city Dr. Inglis's wife's sister assumed the veil, and went clandestinely to a nunnery in New Orleans. Dr. Inglis informed me that he heard the Rev. Dr. Alexander Proudfit of Salem, N. Y., say in a sermon that "Christ was the greatest sufferer, because he was the greatest sinner." In the evening heard Mr. Dashiell, an Episcopal Methodist, from II Peter, ii. 9, "God knoweth how to deliver the godly out of temptaⁿ." It was a ranting extemporaneous effusion; and after sermon he made a prayer of great length and violence. Dr. Ben, an Episcopal clergyman, is supposed to have sickened and died on account of the hazards to which his son was exposed in defending the freedom of the press at Baltimore. For immediately after that event he declined and expired. What increased his unhappiness was that he could not consent that his son should run the hazard of coming to see him while he lived.

21 Dec., Monday. Mr. Appleton, Mr. Wales, and Mr. Payson called at my lodgings, and invited me to dine. We walked down to Fell's Point of famous mob memory. Called on Ardelia Williams and Mrs. Benj. Williams. Dined at Mr. Appleton's with the aforementioned gentlemen, and took tea at Mr. Payson's.

22 Dec., Tuesday. At 6 in the morning took passage in the Vigilance, with brother Lewis Tappan, Wm. Tucker, & Senator Worthington. At 2 arrived at Washington in a tempest of dust, and put up at Davis's hotel. After dinner went to hear the debates in Congress on the final question, Whether the penal bonds of the merchants to the 1 Aug., 1812, shall be cancelled. Carried, 62 against 58. Heard Macon of N. C., Little of M'd, and Roberts of P'a against the merchants & Nelson of Virginia in their favour. Cheeves resembles the Rev. Joshua Bates of Dedham, and Speaker Clay the Rev. Dan'l Dana of Newbury Port. At 6 we took a hack and went to Georgetown to take tea at Isaac S. Gardner's with his father, Gen. Gardner.

23 Dec., Wednesday. Attended debates in Congress on the navy bill, which proposes 6 additional frigates and 4 74s. Heard McKee, Allston, N. C., Milnor, Bassett, Seybert, Stow, Widgery and Potter. Carried in the affirmative, 70 to 56. Potter of R. I. & Champion of Con. the only Federalists against it. A message was communicated from the President relating to the appropriation of the sum voted by Congress in 1805 to Com. Decatur for his valour, &c. The inquiry

¹ Rev. James Inglis, D.D., was born in Philadelphia in 1777, graduated at Columbia College in 1795, and was ordained in 1802 over the First Presbyterian Church, Baltimore, where he died in 1820. See Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vol. iv. pp. 278-284.

was started by Mr. Quincy, who was chairman of the committee. Gholson moved that this communication be referred to the Naval Committee. Mr. D. R. Williams moved to refer it to the committee of investigation, of which Q. was one. Mr. Randolph moved that it be referred to a committee of the whole house that it might be fairly investigated. Thus I had an opportunity to hear Mr. Randolph for the first time. His first appearance promises but little. But his manner is interesting and his eloquence enchanting.

In the evening Mr. Reed of Marblehead called on us in his carriage to go to Mrs. Madison's drawing room. We arrived at about 7, and found a richly furnished room and a splendid company. We were first ushered into a large hall, supported by pillars, where we took off our coats and hats. We were immediately introduced to Mrs. Madison, who received us with great politeness. The President made us on our introduction very stiff and formal bows. Mrs. M., though originally of a Quaker family, was dressed very splendidly with a crown on her head. Her face and neck were obviously daubed with paint so as fairly to glisten. There were two rooms for the guests, around which were elegant seats covered with red morocco, with cushions of the same kind. On these the ladies were seated. The men generally stood, or walked about the rooms. The President paid no attention to the ladies, but was all the time engaged in conversing with the men. The officers of the navy talked with him considerably. But what was most disgusting was to see him in a long, close, and what appeared confidential conversation with Gales, the imported editor of the *National Intelligencer*. The President is a short and small man, with a face shrivelled with care. He is bald, has large earlocks, a club behind precisely like Dr. Osgood's. I watched him a great part of the evening, and in no instance was his face illumined with a smile. No wonder, if he soberly reflects on the evils which he has been instrumental of bringing upon his country. I was introduced to Col. Monroe, who has most of the appearance of a gentleman of any at the palace. I was next introduced to Mons. Gallatin, Sec. of the Treasury. He has quite an original countenance, a dark complexion, black hair, a bald foretop, a large and aquiline nose, black and piercing eyes. Indeed, there is in his appearance a great degree of cunning. Judge Duval is an old and pleasant man. I saw Mons. Serrurier, the French minister, but did not court an introduction to him. He is about 35 years old, has a lively countenance, dresses well, and powders greatly. Mr. John Gore and wife were there from Boston, as also Mr. Motley, Mr. Hastings, and Gen. Gardner of Brookline.

24 Dec., Thursday. Called to see the patent office. Then we attended the launching of the ship *Adams* at the Navy Yard. After the launch went to the sail loft, where I saw Com. Tingey, Paul

Hamilton, Sec. of Navy, Mad. Jerome Bonaparte and her hopeful son, and Mr. Thompson who was so nearly a victim to the brutal ferocity of the Baltimore mob. The gentlemen and ladies danced in the Southern or French style.

25 Dec., Christmas. At 9½ we took a hack for Alexandria, 6½ miles. We crossed the Potowmack over a bridge which is more than a mile long, said to be the longest in the United States. Arrived at Alexandria at 11, and alighted at Triplett's hotel. Went immediately to Dr. Muir's Presbyterian church,¹ and heard Dr. Inglis of Baltimore from Acts x. 43, "To him give all the prophets witness." The discourse was appropriate and well delivered. Dined with Mr. Chs. I. Catlett, to whom I had a letter from S. Higginson, Jr., with b'r Tappan, two Mr. Perkins's, Dr. Muir, & Dr. Inglis. After dinner Gen. Henry Lee, the confidential friend of Washington, an old Revolutionary officer, called. He was very severely handled by the Baltimore mob. His head was covered with a black cloth, where the miscreants had wounded him. His face was covered with scars. His nose had been split longitudinally, and his left eye nearly closed. He knew nothing of Hanson's design to defend his house, when he left Alexandria for Baltimore. His business there was merely to contract with a printer for the publication of his memoirs. He told me that the Spartan band could have defended the house had they not been persuaded to surrender to the civil authority. Had the cannon been fired which was planted before the house he had agreed with 9 others to rush out and take it. Maj. Barney coming up prevented the firing of the cannon, and thus probably saved the lives of great numbers. Gen. Lee knew nothing after his blow early in the evening till midnight. He mentioned the great benefits rendered to the wounded by a pedlar called the Boston Beauty, who was the means of causing the mob to desist from the murder of several. Had they carried arms to the gaol they could have defended themselves. He told several anecdotes of Washington. He was his primary agent for the spy department. When Washington was about accepting the command of the armies of the U. S. he told at Mr. Jas. Riddle's, "If there be an honest patriot in the country, and I believe there are many, Timothy Pickering stands pre-eminent."

Mrs. Catlett is Ann, daughter of Bryan, Lord Fairfax, clergyman of the Episcopal church where Mr. Mead now officiates. She is a handsome, social, and intelligent person. She showed me several letters written by Gen. Washington to her father, persuading him to

¹ Rev. James Muir, D.D., was born at Cumnock in Scotland, April 12, 1757, graduated at the University of Glasgow in 1776, and for several years lived in the island of Bermuda. In 1788 he came to the United States, and in the following year was ordained minister of the Presbyterian Church in Alexandria. He died there Aug. 8, 1820. See Sprague's *Annals of the American Pulpit*, vol. iii. pp. 516-521.

favour the cause of the revolutionists, which he however persisted in opposing.

26 Dec., Saturday. Went in a coach to Mt. Vernon, the seat of the immortal Washington, with Gen. Gardner, two Messrs. Perkins, Mr. Holbrook, and Mr. Winston, a Quaker. We arrived at 11 A. M. The surrounding lands are poor. The place itself is indeed rapidly going to decay. We passed through three gates, connected on each side with lodges for negroes, before we arrived at the mansion house. We get within a few rods of it before it is seen. I had a letter from Mr. Quincy to Bushrod Washington, but he was absent. His steward and gardener showed us the place. Few articles of furniture remain as they were, having been dispersed among his friends. We saw the key and a description of the Bastille in Paris, presented to W. by La Fayette, as also a picture of Louis XVI. Around the parlour fire-place are the most elegant mantle and sides which I have ever seen. It consists of rural scenery finely sculptured in Italian marble. I observed the chamber where W. breathed his last, but it being now the sleeping chamber of the present Mrs. W. we could not of course enter it. We ascertained by the domesticks that W. took his last cold not merely by riding over his farm exposed to a storm of sleet, but by standing a long time in the cold, giving directions about a front path from his house to the river, which path we saw as he left it. When he was buried his corpse lay a long time in the portico. This, it is thought, so familiarized the sight to several of the attendants as to impair the solemnity of the scene. For several became intoxicated, so as to carry away in their pockets whole fowls and even bottles of wine! Of this I was informed by Dr. Dick. The gardener showed us the greenhouse where were considerable quantities of oranges, lemons, and pineapples, but little else.

The house is of an oblong form, with a double front, one facing the river, and the other the garden behind. It presents a fine and extensive view of the Potowmac, which you take from a portico which extends the whole length of the house in front. Toward the river, which is a few rods only from the house, there is a very steep declivity, which used to be improved as a park for deer. Indeed, as far as the eye can reach in all directions from the house, scarcely anything is observable but the river and immense forests.

After contemplating every thing in & around the mansion of the illustrious hero we repaired to the family vault, a few rods southwest from the house to behold his remains. The tomb is excavated from the side of a hill. It is arched at the top, & planted with red cedars. The entrance is at first horizontal. Then you descend a few steps into the bottom of the tomb. It contains 13 coffins. There is nothing to distinguish the coffins of W. and his wife from the others, and indeed

from coffins constructed for common people, but the depredations which the curiosity of visitants has induced them to commit. They were both pine coffins covered with black broadcloth. All the cloth is torn from his coffin, and visitants have begun to cut shavings from the wood itself. The cloth of Mrs. W.'s is not yet wholly removed. I acknowledge that I could not resist the common propensity to bear away some however small memorials of greatness. Accordingly I took a small shaving from W.'s coffin, and a piece of cloth of the size of a 4½^d from that of his wife. It is said that W.'s body was first placed in a leaden coffin which is enclosed by pine. We were told that one of the servants in the family some time ago attempted to steal the skull of W. with a view to carry it to Europe and make gain by exhibiting it. He, however, by mistake got a skull of W.'s uncle; and he was detected in the theft before he had an opportunity of escaping with the spoil.

Coming away we took a glass of wine in the mansion house, and on passing through the first gate we saw the General's favourite servant William for whom he provided in his will. He is now 67 years old, bent down with infirmities, but he appears much as he is represented in the family group of W. Tears ran down his withered cheeks as we recalled to his mind the dear image of his master. On mentioning that we came from Boston and its vicinity his curiosity was greatly excited, and he asked several questions respecting the early scenes of the war, which he himself had witnessed. As we proceeded further a brother of William presented himself at the second gate with a decanter, which was genteely asking alms. We had no disposition to mistake the meaning of such hints. As we came to the third gate an old negro presented himself, having on a cocked hat formerly worn by his master. Our Quaker friend purchased a small piece of it as a curiosity for which he gave a dollar. On our return we dined at the tavern.

P. M. I met with Dr. Muir and the communicants of his church to unite in religious services preparatory to the Communion on the morrow. The exercises consisted of reading the Scriptures, an extemporaneous address by Dr. M., and prayers by Dr. Inglis and myself.

In the evening I preached in his church from Rom. viii. 28, "We know that all things," &c.

I spent the night at Mr. Vowell's, a genteel family, and one of the elders. At family devotions besides reading the Scriptures they sing, and all kneel during prayer. In these services even their blacks joined with great apparent devotion.

27 Dec., Lord's Day. In the morning Dr. Inglis of Baltimore preached a good sermon, from II Peter, iii. 18, "Who once suffered for sins," &c. It was 45 minutes long, and delivered mostly from memory, with many rhetorical flourishes. Then came the Communion

services. There were 3 tables full, amounting in the whole to about 80. Dr. Muir served the first, Dr. Inglis the second, and Mr. Balch of Georgetown the third. We were 3 hours in the whole service. I dined at Mrs. Fendell's, sister of Gen. Lee, with Mr. Holbrook.

P. M. I preached on self government, Prov. xvi. 32, "He that is slow to anger," &c.

In the evening went to Mr. Mead's Episcopal church. He being absent in the country on account of the sickness of his wife, Dr. Inglis preached, by request of the wardens and vestry of the church, from Luke ii. 29, 30, "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace," &c. I spent the night at Mr. Catlett's, where we performed family devotion kneeling.

28 Dec., Monday. Breakfasted at Dr. Muir's with Dr. Dick, one of the attending physicians on Washington in his last illness. He remarked to me that humanly speaking the life of W. might have been spared by opening the windpipe, as his complaint was the same which in children is called croup. He and Craik agreed in opinion, but Dr. Brown dissented, and the plan was frustrated. As to W. closing his own eyes, he heard nothing of it at the time, though with him to the last, and thinks it a mere spasmodick motion. The last words he uttered were, "Dr., I think I die hard." This Dr. Dick was in early life very dissipated. On meeting with a series of domestick afflictions he turned his attention to religious inquiries, and became constant at publick worship, sometimes with Presbyterians, then with Episcopalians, Methodists, and Baptists, and finally became a Quaker, in which sect he was originally educated.

At 10 A. M. rode in a very full stage to Washington. Put up at Miss Hyer's. Attended debates in Congress. Dined with Mr. Bleeker, member from Albany, to whom I had a letter. He informed me that he knew of but 5 or 6 gentlemen in Albany who were not in the habit of attending publick worship constantly both parts of the day.

Took tea at Mrs. Aborn's, formerly from Brookline. Several members of Congress present.

29 Dec., Tuesday. Attended debates in Congress. Heard David R. Williams make a very boisterous and inflammatory speech on introducing the bill for adding 20 regiments to the army. Dined with Messrs. Lloyd and Quincy in company with Benj. Joy and brother Tappan. Took tea with Mr. and Mrs. John Gore.

30 Dec., Wednesday. Went to Georgetown to breakfast with brother T. Visited a Lancaster school in that place instructed by Mr. Oulds, a pupil of Lancaster himself. He exhibited very surprising improvements of his pupils. Went to the cannon foundery. They were boring the cannon from a solid mass of iron by machinery carried by water. Called to see Alex. C. Hanson. He was absent. Returned

to the Capitol, and attended debates. Heard Grundy, Pearson, Talliaferro, Stow, Findley, Baker, D. R. Williams, Ely, Rhea, Goldsborough, Bibb, Widgery, Troup, Gold, Fisk, Quincy, and Desha.

31 Dec., Thursday. Gen. Gardner and I started in the Vigilance for Baltimore on our return home. Brother Tappan is to continue for some time longer. We arrived at Baltimore at about 3 o'clock, P. M., and made several calls.

January, 1813.

1 Jan., Friday. We took the Pilot stage for Philadelphia. We dined at Elkton, 53 miles from Baltimore, and passed the night at Weld's in Wilmington, Delaware.

2 Jan., Saturday. We breakfasted at Anderson's in Chester, and at 2 P. M. arrived at Philadelphia. We put up at Mrs. Benson's. After dinner we called on Mr. Taylor, Rev. Philip F. Mayer,¹ Bishop White, Mrs. Hill, Mrs. Nath. Higginson. Tea at Mr. Mayer's. He gave thanks at table after tea, sitting. No blessing was asked. I find this position is universal in the Middle and Southern States, wherever such a ceremony takes place. This afternoon was very rainy.

3 Jan., Lord's Day. Preached at Mr. Vaughan's church from Mat. xxii. 38, "This is the first and great commandment." Dined with the Rev. Mr. Mayer, and preached for him in the afternoon, from John xviii. 36, "My kingdom is not of this world." After service I was highly entertained with the manner in which Mr. M. addressed his children. There were present 75 boys, 56 girls = 131. Mr. M. mentioned two visionary Swedenborgians at Lancaster, Penn., who to arrive at the greatest perfection agreed to abstain from all animal food. One relented and recovered. The other persisted and died. Tea with Mr. Taylor. Called on several.

4 Jan., Monday. At 3 in the morning started with Gen. Gardner in the Pilot for New York. Breakfasted at Trenton. Dined at Bridgeton. Passed the night at Paulus Hook. Just before arriving at the latter place the horses started at a broken chair, and we were very providentially preserved from being thrown into the ditch!

5 Jan., Tuesday. After breakfast crossed the Hudson, and put up at the City Hotel, New York. Called at several places. Took tea with Mr. Alden.

6 Jan., Wednesday. Took stage for New Haven. Saw the declivity at Horse Neck down which Gen. Putnam fled from the enemy in the Revolutionary War in a very extraordinary manner. Called at

¹ Rev. Philip F. Mayer was born in New York April 1, 1781, and graduated at Columbia College in 1799, studied theology, and was ordained over an English Lutheran church in Philadelphia in 1806. He died there April 16, 1858. See Appleton's Cyclopædia of American Biography, vol. iv. pp. 274, 275.

West Farms, twelve miles from the city, to see my brother Lemuel. In going to this place we went over Haerlem bridge, built over a creek of the same name which extends from East River to the Hudson, and makes the city of New York an island. This bridge is 8 miles from the Battery, at the mouth of the Hudson. We dined this day at Stratford, Connecticut, and spent the night at Nichols's, New Haven.

7 Jan., Thursday. This morning we might have taken the stage at 4, and arrived at Brookline the next day, had not Nichols, with whom we spent the night, deceived us. The only motive which he could have, as far as we could ascertain, was to detain us at his house to breakfast. This gave us a most disgusting specimen of the selfishness which some of the baser sort are capable of practising. We accordingly took passage in a stage which went late in the morning to Hartford only. We arrived at sunset. . . .

At New Haven viewed the Colleges. There are three of the size of those in Cambridge, although not in so good repair, for the accommodation of students. Besides these they have a chapel and reciting halls. The old brick church is just taken down to be rebuilt. At 9 started for Hartford. We dined at Durham, and arrived by sunset at Bennett's in Hartford. At 7 called to see the Rev. Dr. Strong, who although he was well as usual had gone to bed.¹

8 January, Friday. At noon took stage. Spent the night at Ashford in Connecticut, after a bitter cold day's ride.

9 January, Saturday. We breakfasted at Thompson, dined at Clark's, Medfield, and arrived at home in Brookline at six o'clock in the evening, 40 days from my departure.

Mr. Goodhue of Baltimore and Mr. Emery of Philadelphia both remarked that it was a common saying in their respective cities that *their* inhabitants were most distinguished for *religion*, while they acknowledged that the people of Boston and vicinity had the most *morality*!!!

Rev. Dr. Inglis of Baltimore informed me that Hanson and others had enjoyed better health than before since the violent treatment which they had experienced from the Baltimore mob. Mr. H. in particular had some internal complaint from an adhesion of some of the parts to the pleura, but the violent stamping on his breast had occasioned a separation of them, and copious bleeding had restored and confirmed his health.

¹ Rev. Nathan Strong, D.D., was born in Coventry, Conn., Oct. 5, 1748, graduated at Yale College in 1769, and was settled over the First Church in Hartford Jan. 5, 1774. He continued sole pastor of that church until a few weeks before his death, Dec. 25, 1816. Among his numerous publications was an octavo volume of upward of four hundred pages, entitled "The Doctrine of Eternal Misery reconcileable with the Infinite Benevolence of God, and a truth plainly asserted in the Christian Scriptures." See Dexter's Yale Biographies, third series, pp. 357-363.

Mr. Dashiell of Baltimore, a sort of Episcopal Methodist, addressing his hearers in an extempore discourse warned them against hell, saying "What a *miserable crew* will ye be in that place of torment!"

Gen. Henry Lee informed me at Mr. Catlett's, Alexandria, that Washington some time before his death spoke to him plainly of the deceitfulness and hypocrisy of Jefferson.

Dr. Inglis, Dr. Muir, and Gen. Lee spoke of the known and acknowledged piety of Gen. Langan, who was murdered by the Baltimore mob. Gen. Lee remarked that his life might have been spared had he not attempted to expostulate with the wretches, and showed them the wounds which he received in his country's cause, while they were in France or among the bogs of Ireland.

Called in the evening of the 3d of Jan. to hear Dr. Staughton, a famous Baptist preacher in Philadelphia. He was just closing, and I could perceive by his tones one great source of his popularity. He has a large, new, elegant house, of a rotund form, which was entirely full. There is a baptistery in the middle of the church. Notwithstanding his great popularity, and the large numbers who flock to hear him, he is obliged to keep an apothecary's shop for his support. This is owing to several causes. It is natural for the sect to have more faith than works. Generosity is a carnal virtue. Besides the hearers are commonly among the poor in this world's goods, who are as unable as they are unwilling to support their minister.

I was charmed with the catholicism of the ministers and people of Alexandria. The Episcopalians, Presbyterians, and Methodists have unrestrained religious as well as civil intercourse. I heard a Presbyterian preach an evening lecture in an Episcopal church by desire of the wardens and vestry.

At Philadelphia, I ascertained by Mr. John Vaughan that there are in that city 50 churches of all the different denominations.

To this narrative I will now add only two other citations. The first is Dr. Pierce's account of one of his last interviews with John Quincy Adams. It is as follows:—

Lord's Day, 28 July, 1844, I exchanged with the Rev. Wm. Parsons Lunt of Quincy, and dined with Hon. John Quincy Adams, Ex-President. He has not yet wholly recovered from bruises occasioned by a fall from a platform as he was passing from the cars to the steamboat, travelling from Washington home. It was dark. He heard a rumbling noise as if the baggage car was coming upon him. In leaping aside to save himself he fell from a platform on to the stones, about 4 feet, and dragged his wife with him. They were both badly bruised, but no limbs were broken, a remarkable preservation!

Mr. Adams appears much feebler than did his father at his age. He

assigns as one reason of this difference that his father almost wholly abstained from public business on leaving the Presidency at 66, while he, now past 77, has been uninterruptedly engaged in public affairs.

In speaking of the Rev. Anthony Wibird, the minister of Quincy during Mr. A.'s youth, he observed that they met at his uncle Cranch's, and that Mr. W. afterward said to his uncle that his interview with the youth reminded him of that poetical line, —

“Curse on the stripling! how he apes his sire.”

In his room there was a picture of Edward Boylston, son of Edward, who was brother of his great-grandfather Peter. Consequently Edward Boylston, Jr., was cousin of Mr. Adams's grandmother, Susanna Adams (Boylston). This was a handsome picture, with a letter in the hand directed to the elder Professor Wigglesworth. Boylston sent the picture from the West Indies to his mother in Boston. Professor Wigglesworth claimed the picture on the ground of the letter directed to him. On the death of the mother the picture was sent to him, John Adams carrying it to him in his Freshman year, 1751. On the death of Professor Wigglesworth, Ward Nicholas Boylston purchased this picture at auction, and presented it to the elder Adams.

Mr. Adams spoke with high admiration of George S. Hillard's two orations which he has heard, the first when Mr. H. was graduated, but especially his Φ B K oration on the last August. He contrasted it to the first 13 5 March & 4 July orations, greatly in preference of Mr. H.'s composition. He thought these orations as a whole were poor and lean productions.

He spoke of his Class at College. Freeman, as I had heard before, had the closing oration, the most honorable assignment at Commencement, on the ground of being considered the best writer, a very handsome & graceful young man, and one of the best speakers who was ever educated at Harvard University. Mr. Adams did not consider him the best scholar in the Class. He believed that this honor belonged to Bridge.

Asa Johnson, the oldest in the Class, and a great metaphysician, was an avowed atheist, the only person of this description whom Mr. Adams has ever known. He had a perfect self-command, which could not be shaken by any excitement which he produced in his fellow disputants. He was afterwards a lawyer in Worcester county, and maintained a respectable standing in character and profession.

Freeman was intended for the ministry, but after leaving College he studied law, married early, and went to Congress. He . . . [died] when a little past 30 years of age.¹

¹ In the issues of the Triennial Catalogue of Harvard University since 1854, and in the Quinquennials, Nathaniel Freeman, who died in 1800, is errone-

President Adams confirmed the accounts which have been current of his grandfather Smith's sermons on the marriage of his daughters. The Rev. William Smith, native of Charlestown, H. U. 1725, was ordained in Weymouth 4 Dec., 1734, and died 29 Sep., 1783, æ. 77.

At the marriage of his daughter Mary to Judge Cranch, greatly approving of the match, he preached from Luke x. 42, "Mary hath chosen that good part which shall not be taken from her."

At the marriage of Abigail to John Adams, a lawyer, he preached with reference to the prejudices of the common people against that profession, Mat. xi. 18, "John came neither eating nor drinking, & they say he hath a devil."

When his daughter Elisabeth was married to the Rev. John Shaw of Haverhill, his text was John i. 6, "There was a man sent from God, whose name was John."

These women, whose mother was a Quincy, though educated in the obscure country town of Weymouth, were among the best educated females of the day, especially the distinguished wife of the celebrated John Adams.

The other citation is one of the latest and best of Dr. Pierce's characterizations of a contemporary, — that of Rev. Samuel Ripley of Waltham, a member of this Society from 1820 to 1847. It fitly supplements the notice of Mr. Ripley which was prepared by his son, the late Hon. C. G. Ripley, at the request of the Committee for publishing the Early Proceedings.¹

Events are often occurring in God's providential government of the world which serve to exhibit in a striking point of view the uncertainty of human life, and the vanity of all expectations which centre in the present state. Of this kind is not only the melancholy providence last related,² but also the recent sudden demise of the Rev. Samuel Ripley, successor for a number of years of the Rev. Jacob Cushing, D. D., of Waltham, but for some time past an inhabitant of Concord, and a stated supply of a new small church in the neighboring town of Lincoln.

Samuel Ripley was born in Concord on 11 March, 1783, son of Dr. Ezra Ripley, who died on 21 September, 1841, a little past 90 years of age, having sustained a ministry of 62 y. 10 m. 13 da. His mother was

ously described as a member of the Historical Society. His father, of the same name, was elected a member in October, 1792, and the name was borne on the roll of members until October, 1808. See Proceedings, vol. i. pp. 43, 44, 199, 500*n*. See also Freeman's History of Cape Cod, vol. i. p. 561; vol. ii. p. 148; Thacher's Medical Biography, vol. ii. pp. 241-246.

¹ Proceedings, vol. ii. pp. 392-394.

² The death of Hon. Alexander H. Everett, June 29, 1847.

Phebe Bliss, daughter of a former minister of Concord, and when he married her, the widow of the Rev. William Emerson.

Mr. Ripley was fitted for college by his father, and was graduated, a respectable scholar, in the class of 1804, consisting at graduation of 60, but which is now reduced to 24 who remain among the living. The reason his name does not appear on the order of exercises at Commencement is that he obtained leave of absence before the parts for Commencement were assigned, in order to go into a family in the city of Washington as a private tutor. He, however, did not allow his occupation as the preceptor of youth to interfere with his favorite purpose of preparation for the ministry. But studying divinity with his father, he was ordained 22 November, 1809, successor of Dr. Jacob Cushing, 57 years to a day after the ordination of his immediate predecessor. The salary voted him was \$700, without any other consideration. This evidently was insufficient for the support of a family.

Soon after ordination he married Sarah Bradford, daughter of Capt. Gamaliel Bradford, then resident in Charlestown. As she brought him no dowry but her highly cultivated mind, and as they judged it expedient to erect a large and expensive house, it became indispensable that they should make provision by other means besides his salary for the payment of their debts and the support of their family. The method which they united to employ was the tuition of children, particularly the preparation of young men for the University. For such a purpose their house was specially designed; and a great aid in carrying this design into effect was the co-operation of his accomplished wife, who, it has been confidently maintained, understands 7 foreign languages, Latin, Greek, Hebrew, French, Italian, Spanish, and German, probably better than any other man or woman in the United States. But her knowledge is not confined to the learned languages alone. But she is as accomplished in domestic concerns as in mental cultivation. The circumstance which contributed to her acquaintance with the care of a family was the loss of her mother by death when she herself was quite young. This led her father to depend wholly on her for the conduct of his household concerns. Thus trained from early youth, she became admirably qualified to manage her own family when it was enlarged, not only by the increase of her own children, but also by the admission of pupils into the household. Not only was Mrs. Ripley "a help meet for her husband" in transacting his domestic concerns, but also in instructing the children. When scholars are dismissed from the University to prosecute their college studies at the place of their suspension, she has been enabled to instruct them in their most advanced studies. With such a partner, and by diligent attention to the duties of his profession, Mr. Ripley was enabled respectably to discharge his

official duties as pastor as well as the management of the pupils intrusted to his care.

His course for the most part was independent. He at first commenced his ministry with asserting his right to vote at the election of rulers. But this measure gave such irreconcilable offence to some of his political opponents who possessed great influence among his people, that he was at length reluctantly induced to forego his right of voting for offices of the state and general governments.

In process of time so difficult had it become to prepare for the pulpit, to visit his people, and at the same time pay suitable attention to his flock, that he at length judged it expedient to have a colleague. Accordingly when he was 58½, and had been ordained 32 years, the Rev. George F. Simmons, who afterwards became his son-in-law, was ordained his colleague 27 October, 1841. His ministry, however, from a variety of causes was destined to be short. He was succeeded by the Rev. Thomas Hill, who was ordained 24 December, 1845.¹

Early in 1846, Mr. Ripley, having retired from the ministry in Waltham, sold his estate there, and taken charge of a small society in Lincoln, removed to his father's house in Concord. Here he indulged the fond hope of enjoying a vigorous old age in the bosom of his family, among the few surviving friends of his youth and his riper years, and in the quiet discharge of pastoral duties among the little flock which he had taken under his special care. But the providence of God had other designs. Truly, "man appoints; but God disappoints." On 24 November [1847], the day before the last Thanksgiving, Mr. Ripley had ridden in his carriage to a neighboring railroad depot to convey to his house some family connexions who had come to pass that season of festivity at his house. On his return, in the dusk of the evening, and in a violent tempest of rain, without the slightest premonition, he fell back in his carriage; and when light was brought from a house which they were passing it was soon ascertained that life had become extinct! Alas! how sudden the transition for his family from the height of anticipation to the deepest depression! Surely, "in the midst of life we are in death." "Verily every man, at his best estate, is altogether vanity."

Two of Mr. Ripley's sons have been graduated at Harvard University; Christopher Gore Ripley, in 1841, and Ezra Ripley, in 1846.

Considering the multiplicity of Mr. Ripley's avocations he was more than commonly acceptable as a preacher in the surrounding parishes.

¹ Dr. Pierce was present at the ordination of Mr. Ripley, and at that of Mr. Simmons; but he was not present at the ordination of Mr. Hill, probably on account of his visit to Plymouth two days before. Mr. Ripley belonged to what was called the Liberal party, and after he had exhibited a written confession of faith to the Council, he was subjected to a rigid examination by the so-called Orthodox members. His answers were not satisfactory to them, and on a motion to "proceed to the ordination," four would not assent to it.

He preached his 32d and 33d sermons in Brookline on 24 Nov., 1839, just 8 years to a day previously to his death. In this last day of his service here, he discussed "the great and precious promises of the gospel," which, it is devoutly to be hoped, he has gone to participate. He has left a wife who is an ornament to her sex, 2 sons and 5 daughters. He has survived his venerable father but 6 years, 2 months, and 3 days. It is very observable that in a large Association of ministers, on the death of his father he became, as next in age, the moderator. His predecessor, the venerable Dr. Jacob Cushing, gave me the solemn charge at my ordination; and his successor, the Rev. Thomas Hill, gave the right hand of fellowship at the late ordination of my colleague.¹

Mr. FRANKLIN B. SANBORN presented to the Library a copy of the fourth edition of Thomas Watson's "Body of Divinity," which had belonged to Rev. William Smith of Weymouth, father of Mrs. John Adams. It consists of "above one hundred and seventy-six sermons on the Lesser Catechism," and long enjoyed a great degree of popularity, having been reprinted, so recently as 1855, more than a century and a half after its first publication.

The new volume of Collections — Seventh Series, Volume V. — was on the table for distribution to those members who had not already received it.

¹ In the foregoing characterization Dr. Pierce fell into some errors in regard to Mr. Ripley. He not only studied divinity with his father, but also in the College at Cambridge, and was not married until nearly nine years after ordination. In this interval he built the house referred to by Dr. Pierce, and carried on a school in addition to discharging his ministerial duties. At the time of his marriage he had fourteen pupils. After his marriage the plan of his school was much enlarged, and he was greatly aided by his accomplished wife, whose acquirements, however, are here somewhat exaggerated. An excellent memoir of Mr. Ripley, with extracts from his correspondence, was privately printed in 1897 by his son-in-law, our late associate Mr. James B. Thayer.

MEMOIR

OF

HENRY WALBRIDGE TAFT.

BY JAMES M. BARKER.

THE subject of this memoir was a Resident Member of the Society from the year 1894 until his death, on September 22, 1904, at the age of eighty-five years, ten months, and nine days.

Although fond of historical research, owing to his advanced age and the remoteness of his home from the place of the meetings of the Society, he never took part in its discussions or contributed to its Proceedings.

It is fortunate that the story of his life, nearly to the end, can be stated here in his own words. Among his papers and in his own handwriting has been found the following sketch prepared by him for a relative in the West about the year 1900:—

Henry Walbridge Taft, son of Horace W. and Mary (Montague) Taft, was born at Sunderland, Massachusetts, November 13, 1818. He partly fitted for college at Amherst Academy, but various hindrances prevented his entering upon a college course. He spent a year and upward (1836–1837) at Greenfield in the office of Elijah Alvord, Esq., then Clerk of the Courts and Register of Probate for Franklin County. The experience obtained in this service was a material advantage to him in the early years of his professional life.

In the spring of 1838, at the request of a relative who had a business interest in the paper, he assumed the editorial charge of the "Massachusetts Eagle," the leading Whig newspaper of Berkshire County, then published at Lenox and still continued at Pittsfield under the name of the "Berkshire



Henry M. Taylor

County Eagle." In this employment he passed the remainder of the year 1838 and part of the following year, and again took charge of the paper for a few months during the presidential campaign of 1840. In the mean time he had entered the office of the late Judge Henry W. Bishop at Lenox as a student at law; and in the summer of 1841 he received an offer of copartnership from Robbins Kellogg, Esq., a lawyer of many years' standing in the neighboring town of West Stockbridge, then in failing health. He accepted the offer and removed to West Stockbridge in August, 1841, and was admitted to the bar at the following October term at Lenox. In the month of November of the same year Mr. Kellogg died, leaving his professional business in the hands of Mr. Taft, who continued the practice of his profession at West Stockbridge until the close of the year 1852. He represented the town in the Legislature of 1847.

In the early part of the year 1853 Mr. Taft was appointed Register of Probate for the County of Berkshire and removed to Lenox. He continued there in the practice of his profession and in the discharge of his official duties for about two years, when, in common with several Massachusetts office-holders who declined to give in their adhesion to the new Native American or "Know Nothing" party which had triumphed in the election of November, 1854, he was removed from office.

In January, 1856, he was appointed by the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts Clerk of the Court for the County of Berkshire. By a change in the Constitution this office became elective in the same year, and he was chosen for the full term of five years, and has since held the office by eight successive elections, his last term closing January 6, 1897, when he retired, having declined a re-election, after serving for the full period of forty-one years.

Mr. Taft removed in 1871 from Lenox to Pittsfield, where he has since resided. The new Court House was first used for the session of the full bench of the Supreme Judicial Court September 11th of that year. The first day's session was given up to appropriate dedicatory exercises, and Mr. Taft delivered the address.

During the period which has elapsed since his admission to the bar he has settled many estates as executor or trustee, and tried very many cases in his own and the adjoining counties

as auditor, master, or referee. He was for seventeen years a trustee of the State Lunatic Hospital at Northampton. He has been president of the Third National Bank of Pittsfield since its organization in 1881. He is a member of the Massachusetts Historical Society, the American Antiquarian Society, and several local societies of kindred character.

When he retired from the office of Clerk the members of the bar joined in a request for his portrait. He assented and the portrait has been painted and placed in the Court House.

Mr. Taft was married at Lenox, October 12, 1842, to Harriet Worthington, daughter of Dr. Charles Worthington. She died on October 17, 1860. On October 2, 1862, he was married to Lucy N. Raymond, of Lenox, who died on January 26, 1904. There was no issue by either marriage.

Mr. Taft was calm and gentle in temperament, yet firm, decided, and industrious. In person he was tall and of slender figure. His manners and dress were those of the courteous officials of the old school, so well known to the country life of New England. His probity, his well-known religious feeling, his business sense, and wide knowledge of law and of affairs gained for him a high place in the community where he lived.

His recreation and delight were in the line of historical and genealogical investigation and in the collection of autographs. Two valuable volumes of his collections, through the courtesy of his heir and of the executor of his will, have been given to this Society.

Besides his leading articles in the files of the "Massachusetts Eagle," his printed works are a "History of the Town of Sunderland down to the Year 1753," a "Genealogical Record of the Inhabitants of Sunderland," a sketch "Sunderland Village, 1825-30," an "Historical Address at the Dedication of the Berkshire Court House, 1871," and a "Judicial History of Berkshire."

The Sunderland papers are to be found in a volume entitled "History of Sunderland, 1673-1899," published at Greenfield in the year 1899, to which he also contributed the preface.

For the Monday Evening Club of Pittsfield he wrote essays on "Rights of Property," "One Hundred Years Ago

(1872)," "Our National Dangers," "History and Archæology," "Random Thoughts," "The Tories of New England," "Municipal Government," "Domestic Life in New England Sixty Years Ago (1884)," "Popular Fallacies," and a "Memoir of George Patrick Briggs."

A more extended account of Mr. Taft's life and works will be found in the Transactions of the Berkshire Historical and Scientific Association for the year 1905.